



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600010781N

26. 638







A

J. H. 1826

SUPPLEMENTAL LETTER

TO

CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ.

ON

SOME PARTS OF THE EVIDENCE GIVEN BY THE IRISH
ROMAN-CATHOLIC BISHOPS,

PARTICULARLY BY DR. DOYLE,

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEES OF THE TWO HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT,
IN THE SESSION OF 1825.

AND

ALSO ON CERTAIN PASSAGES IN DR. DOYLE'S
"ESSAY ON THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS."



BY

REV. HENRY PHILLPOTTS, D.D.

RECTOR OF STANHOPE.



LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

MDCCCXXVI.

638.



LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM,

LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

MY LORD,

IN seeking for this small work the protection of your Lordship's name, I am influenced not merely by my high respect for your distinguished character, nor even by my grateful sense of the kindness with which you have long honoured me.

My former volume was inscribed to my revered Patron, the Bishop of Durham ; and I cannot soon forget that the last commission with which he will ever charge

me, was to convey to your Lordship his heartfelt thanks for the affection which you had borne to him. I feel it, therefore, now, a source of melancholy pleasure, as well as the gratification of an honest pride, to bring together in the dedication of these volumes the names of two such Men, so connected by mutual affection, by kindred virtues, and by common zeal in the defence of that great cause, which my feeble efforts are designed to serve.

I am,

My Lord,

With sincere and great respect,

Your Lordship's obliged

And most faithful Servant,

HENRY PHILLPOTTS.

LONDON,
March 17th, 1826.

SUPPLEMENTAL LETTER

TO

CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ.

SIR,

YOUR new volume, entitled "Vindication of the Book of the Roman-Catholic Church," &c., has just reached me, and, as far as my work is concerned, I beg leave to congratulate you on the very ingenious mode which you have adopted, to dispose of the charges adduced by me against you. You give* the title of my book, and are then pleased to say what follows:—"As fair specimens of the spirit and style of this publication, and of the worth of the charges brought in it against me, I select from it,—I. The author's *criminations of my statement of the Roman-Catholic doctrine of purgatory*; II. His crimi-

* Page xxxix.

“ nations of my statement of the Roman-Catholic Doctrine of Sacramental Absolution ; and
 “ III. His criminations of the expression
 “ *Dominium altum*, used by me in a former
 “ work, to describe the Pope's spiritual authority in extraordinary cases of a spiritual
 “ nature, and exerted by Pius VII. in his
 “ transactions with Napoleon.”

Beginning with the first, I shall copy from the
 “ Book of the Roman-Catholic Church, the
 “ passage respecting Purgatory reprehended by
 “ Dr. Phillpotts ;” (this is done faithfully) “ and
 “ *then copy his remarks upon it*, and his citation
 “ from Calvin, of the passage in that author,
 “ to which I referred ;” the latter part of this
 promise is also faithfully performed. But as to
 the former, will my readers believe it possible,
 that after having thus, twice within half a page,
 declared that you “ will select my criminations
 “ of your statement of the Roman-Catholic
 “ doctrine of Purgatory,” and “ will copy my
 “ remarks” upon them ; (it was well you did
 not, for they extend through five and forty
 pages ;) you have the confidence to affect to
 redeem your pledge, by copying one of the
 most unimportant matters, occupying less than
 a fifteenth part of the whole ; one single in-
 stance of your mistatement, upon which you

fancy that you can contrive to raise a little fresh cloud of sophistication? Really, I am ashamed of my adversary, and will have nothing more to say to you. Talk, if you will, about Calvin, and prove again and again, if you will, the whole of what I have already proved against you respecting him—you shall have the field to yourself.

Your lively friend Dr. Lingard, who offers “you his congratulations” (I doubt not with his usual sincerity,) “on *the eminent services which by your works you have rendered to the Catholic cause,*” shall be treated by me with almost as little ceremony. He has laboured effectually to prove, that no satisfactory answer can be given to my charge against him; thanking him, therefore, for his assistance, I consign the few observations I shall make on him to a note below.*

* I begin with stating how his case stands in points which admit not of any more discussion.

1. He endeavoured to throw a general air of discredit over the second Nicene Council, except as far as relates to the doctrinal decree passed in the last session.—In answer to this, I have shown by the strongest testimony, that *the Council is one of the very highest authority.* To this there is no reply.

2. He said particularly, “the *Acts* of this Council are of no authority in the Catholic church.”—I have challenged him

In my present address to you, there will be nothing that applies particularly to yourself, or

to produce evidence of this assertion, and have myself produced evidence of the contrary, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, Cardinal Bellarmine, and Pope Adrian I. In his Letter to Mr. Butler, p. 222, he says, " Catholics admit the Second Nicene Council, and subscribe to its decrees respecting the faith of the church; they refer to its acts as an historical document, but not as doctrinal authority binding their belief."

Now, of the acts, almost every one contain doctrinal decrees, affirmed with an Anathema, and therefore binding on the belief of the Roman Catholic Church. At the end of the second is given, *nominatim*, the assent of the several Fathers to the doctrine contained in the Synodical Epistle of Adrian, with an anathema against those who oppose it. At the end of the fourth, as well as of the last, there is an actual subscription by the legates from Rome, and of all the other members of the Council. They are, therefore, complete doctrinal authority; and Dr. Lingard's subterfuge will not serve him. He has stated the thing which is not, and when his misstatement is proved against him, he has neither the manliness nor the honesty to admit it.

3. He insinuated (and, I repeat, that an honest man ought to feel, that to insinuate what is untrue, is as bad as to affirm it,) he insinuated, that *only* " the doctrinal decree passed in " the last session," not the acts of this Council at its other sessions, " was approved by the Popes."—In contradiction to this, I have adduced the express approbation given to all the acts, nay, a detailed answer to all objections against them, by the very Pope, Adrian I., who, by his legates, presided at the Council. Dr. Lingard dares not hazard a syllable in his own

to any of your learned labours ; but I shall take the liberty of using this form of address for the

defence on this point. Here, then, we again have *confitentem reum*.

4. He has said that " In the Acts and Canons of this Council much is contained, to which the Roman Church would never impart its sanction, *quæ apud nos nec habentur, nec admittuntur*, says Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a Roman writer of the same age."

It has been proved, and is admitted, that these latter words are an inaccurate citation, that they ought to stand in the genuine text as follows, *quæ penes nos interpretata nec habentur nec admittuntur* ; and that they refer to certain particular things there specified.

Dr. Lingard says, that he does not know, whether the omission of the word " interpretata " arose from the negligence of the printer, or from his own inadvertence ! that it evidently was not intentional, because *the omission could not strengthen his cause*.

Let our readers look at the whole sentence, as produced by me (p. 106.) in its genuine state, and judge for themselves. Does it not specify certain matters in no way concerned in the argument between us, which, therefore, even if Dr. Lingard could truly say that they were rejected by the Church of Rome, would have left my citations from the council wholly unaffected ? Why then did he not cite the words of Anastasius in such a manner as to shew their *specific* application ? What honest reason can be assigned for the omission ?

But the truth is, that the words of Anastasius do not, when properly understood, imply that any part of the proceedings of the Council were rejected by the Church of Rome. To make it appear that they do, Dr. Lingard affirms, that both the larger Collection of Apostolic Canons, and that of the Council of Trullo (the quinisextian) were not only " quoted with applause,

more convenient arrangement of the matter I have to treat.

That matter is not unimportant: for it relates to the endeavours recently made by the prelates of your communion in Ireland, particularly by Dr. Doyle, to give such a view of the doctrine and practices of your church, as is, in my honest opinion, utterly fallacious. I shall avail myself, therefore, of the publicity given to their evidence before the two Houses of Parliament, to examine a few of the particulars of that evidence with freedom, but, I trust, with candour.

“but approved and confirmed by the Second Nicene Council in the strongest terms.”

I defy Dr. Lingard to produce the passage on which he founds these assertions. Will he cite the first canon of the last-named council? That only orders generally the observance of the Apostolic Canons, and those of the six general Councils, in which number that of Trullo was not, though the Greeks call its canons those of the sixth council. (Accordingly Bellarmine considers only one of the canons of Trullo, the eighty-second, which had been cited in the second and fourth acts, as admitted by the second Nicene Council.) And it is the object of Anastasius to show that, whatever is admitted by this General Council being of course admitted by the Church of Rome, none of the apostolic or quinisextian canons, contrary to former canons, &c. are therein admitted.

Here, then, I leave “DR. LINGARD,” re-affirming my former charge against “HIS UNFAITHFULNESS IN QUOTATION” with increased evidence.

Taking the matters in the order in which they occur in my former letters to you, I begin with the evidence respecting

“PRAYER TO THE VIRGIN MARY AND TO SAINTS.”

Dr. Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, tells the Committee of the House of Commons, that “Roman Catholics believe, that God “ may be inclined to hear requests made in our “ behalf by them, and to grant us many favours “ through their intercession : that invocation “ of saints, for this purpose, is no more injurious “ to Christ, our mediator, than it is for one “ Christian to beg the prayers of another in this “ world, as St. Paul did.” “ When they in- “ voke the Virgin Mary, they do not consider “ that she can grant favours of herself, but “ that she may, through her powerful interces- “ sion, obtain favours from God for us.” p. 240. On a subsequent day, a Latin prayer to the Virgin is adduced, of which the following is an extract ; “ te deprecor ut mea inopia sublevetur, “ ut per te purgationem peccatorum obtineam ;” and Dr. Kelly says, that “ the use of the word “ *per* constitutes it a prayer of intercession ; “ that it is through her intercession only, that “ all those favours are sought to be obtained by “ this prayer.”—p. 264.

Now this, at least, is making the distinction to be very finely drawn, and suspends the whole weight of the honour due to God on a very slender thread : to any one who may chance to use this prayer without understanding this solitary preposition in Dr. Kelly's sense, (which is by no means its only, or its most obvious sense,) it is then an act of the utmost impiety, it is a transfer to a mere creature of the honour due, by the word of God, to God only.

But let this pass—let it be granted for a moment, and only for a moment, that the Virgin is always addressed merely as a mediatrix of intercession—What is the value which the Church of Rome assigns to her intercession ? Is it held to be so powerful, as to ensure absolute acceptance of any prayer addressed for us by her, to her blessed son ? If it be, the result is practically the same as if she were able to grant every thing by her own mere power : and that it is, will require very little investigation to prove.

I have shown, in my second letter to you, the blasphemous excess of honour, the representation of her more than human dignity, given in your breviary. I will now adduce a prayer to her, set forth so lately as in the year 1822, by Pius VII. and by his special command ap-

pointed (with one or two others of the same sort) to be distributed *gratis*, for the use of the people of Rome, with an Indulgence of 300 days for those who use them once, and a plenary Indulgence for those who use them every day for an entire month.*

“ I adore thee, most Holy Virgin, Queen of
 “ Heavens, Lady and Patroness of the Uni-
 “ verse, as daughter of the Eternal Father,
 “ Mother of his most beloved Son, and most
 “ gracious spouse of the Holy Ghost ; and, pros-
 “ trate at the feet of thy great Majesty, with all
 “ possible humility, I supplicate thee, by that
 “ divine love, with which thou wast filled on thy
 “ assumption into Heaven, to grant me so much
 “ grace and mercy, as to receive me under thy
 “ most secure and faithful protection, and to
 “ number me among thy most happy and joyful
 “ servants, whom thou bearest engraven in thy
 “ virgin bosom. Vouchsafe, O my most merciful
 “ Mother and Lady, to receive this miserable
 “ and impure heart ; take my memory, my
 “ will, and all my other faculties and senses,
 “ both internal and external ; accept my eyes,

* Orazione da recitarsi da chi desidera acquistarsi la protezione della santissima Vergine e di ottenere qualche grazia purchè sia espediente per l' eterna salute. In Roma. 1822. Pel Bourliè. La presente orazione si dispensa gratis.

“ my ears, my mouth, my hands, my feet ; rule
 “ them and make them conformed to the good
 “ pleasure of thy sweet Son (*figliuolo*), intending
 “ at every movement of them to give to thee
 “ infinite glory,” &c.

I will next present you with some specimens of prayers to her, which are *now* in daily use among the Roman Catholics of this very land. They are selected* from “ The Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, including the *Devotion to the Sacred Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with an appendix,*” (by R. R. John Milner, Bishop of Castabala, Vicar Apostolic,) “ and the Indult of his holiness, Pius VII. in favour of it, *for the use of the midland district.*” 12th edition. Keating and Brown, 1821.

THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF MARY.

SECTION I.

“ As the adorable heart of Jesus was formed
 “ in the chaste womb of the blessed Virgin,

* Since this selection was made, I find that I have been in part anticipated by Mr. Blanco White, in the Appendix to his “ Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism.” Let me avail myself of this opportunity to bear my humble testimony to the worth of that inestimable volume, a volume which I venture to characterize as the most valuable contribution which the Church of England has received in its controversy with the Church of Rome, for more than a century.

“ and of her blood and substance, so we cannot, in a more proper and agreeable manner, show our devotion to the sacred heart of the Son, than by dedicating some part of the said devotion to the ever pure heart of the Mother. For you have two hearts here united in the most strict alliance and tender conformity of sentiments, so that it is not in nature to please the one without making yourself agreeable to the other, and acceptable to both. Go then, devout client, go to the heart of Jesus, but let your way be through the heart of Mary. The sword of grief which pierced her soul opens you a passage: enter by the wound love has made; advance to the heart of Jesus, and rest there even to death itself. Presume not to separate and divide two objects so intimately one or united together, but ask redress in all your exigences from the heart of Jesus, and ask this redress through the heart of Mary.

“ This form and method of worship is the doctrine and the very spirit of God’s church; it is what she teaches us in the unanimous voice and practice of the faithful, who will by no means that Jesus and Mary should be separated from each other, in our prayers, praises, and affections.”

“ Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be! come and behold! Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, *though, unfortunately, proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful Advocate.* Her throne, though so exalted, has nothing forbidding, nothing dreadful; her heart is all love, all tenderness. *If you have the least remains of confidence and reliance on her protection, doubt not she will carry you through her own most blessed heart in the most speedy and most favourable manner, to the truly merciful and most sacred heart of her Son Jesus.*”—p. 198—201.

AN ANGELICAL EXERCISE.

“ I reverence you, O sacred Virgin Mary, the Holy Ark of the Covenant; and together with all the good thoughts of all good men upon earth, and all the blessed spirits in heaven, *do bless and praise you infinitely, for that you are the great Mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the blessed Trinity.* Hail Mary.”—p. 293.

"THE THIRTY DAYS PRAYER."

. It is particularly recommended as a proper devotion for every day in Lent, and all the Fridays throughout the year.

" Ever glorious and blessed Mary, Queen of
 " Virgins," &c. " Thou art the Mother of Mercy,
 " the sweet consolatrix, and *only refuge* of the
 " needy and the orphans, of the desolate and
 " the afflicted ; cast, therefore, an eye of pity on
 " a miserable forlorn child of Eve, and hear
 " my prayer ; whither can I fly for more se-
 " cure shelter, O amiable Mother of my Lord
 " and Saviour Jesus Christ, than under the
 " wings of thy maternal protection ?" " And,
 " as I am persuaded, *my divine Saviour doth ho-
 " nour thee as his beloved Mother, TO WHOM HE
 " CAN REFUSE NOTHING, so let me speedily
 " experience the efficacy of thy powerful inter-
 " cession, according to the tenderness of thy
 " maternal affection, and his filial loving heart,
 " who mercifully granteth the requests and
 " complieth with the desires of those that love
 " and fear him.*"—p. 305—311.

So much for prayers to her as a Mediatrix of intercession ; let us now proceed to some of higher pretension.

“ A practice made use of by St. Mechtildis.”
—p. 212, 213.

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Father, by his omnipotence, has made
“ *thee most powerful, so assist us at the hour of our*
“ *death, by defending us against all power that is*
“ *contrary to thine. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Son has endowed thee with so much
“ knowledge and charity, that it enlightens
“ all heaven, so *in the hour of our death illustrate*
“ *and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of*
“ *the true faith, that they be not perverted by*
“ *error or pernicious ignorance. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Virgin, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth
“ into thee the love of God, so *instil * into us at*
“ *the hour of death, the sweetness of divine love,*

* The following is an extract from a prayer to St. Aloysius.—
p. 348, 349.

“ Angelical youth, Aloysius, *by the particular appointment of*
“ *God's Vicar upon Earth, Patron of those who apply to stu-*
“ *dies.*” “ For the love thou hadst for Christ crucified and
“ his most blessed Mother, receive me as thy client and obedient
“ servant ; aid and assist me in the pursuit of virtue and learning ;
“ nourish and increase in me a purity of mind and manners ;
“ turn off the snares laid against my chastity ; ward and defend
“ me against the dangers of the world ; *inspire my heart with a*

“ that all bitterness at that time may become
 “ acceptable and pleasant to us. Hail Mary.

“ *Our blessed Lady herself taught St. Mechtildis the abovementioned triple salutation, promising her certain assistance for it at the hour of her death.*”—p. 212, 213.

AN ANGELICAL EXERCISE.

“ I am an amiable and loving Mother, Mater
 “ amabilis, says the glorious Virgin Mary, Mo-
 “ ther of God. Will you, my dear child, do
 “ something this day in my honour? For you
 “ must know, that *I leave nothing, though of never*
 “ *so little value, unrecompensed, which is done in*
 “ *my honour*; as Troilus Savelli, a young Baron
 “ of Rome, though a great and enormous sin-
 “ ner, can well testify, who, at the end of his
 “ life, being beheaded for his wickedness, ob-
 “ tained by my favour so perfect contrition and
 “ remission of his sins, that *he died like a Saint,*
 “ *for having never failed to say once a day on his*
 “ *bare knees one Ave Maria in my honour.* I as-
 “ sure you, in the sincerity of a Mother, that at

“ *true and filial confidence in the ever blessed Virgin Mary, the*
 “ *Mother of good counsels*; govern and direct me in my choice
 “ of a state of life, and let the grace of God be my perpetual
 “ defence against all mortal sin; that assisted by thy patronage
 “ and aided by the Grace of God, &c.”

“ the hour of your death, being forsaken of all
 “ your friends, you will wish to have performed
 “ all things possible to obtain my grace and fa-
 “ vour. Hail Mary.”—p. 286.

In order that my readers may know what it costs to die like a saint in this most accommodating Church, I will transcribe an Ave Maria.—
 “ Ave Maria, gratiâ plena; Dominus tecum:
 “ benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus
 “ fructus ventris tui, Jesus.” This is all.

Again: “ I am the Protectress of my Servants,
 “ says the glorious Mother of God. Give me your
 “ heart, my dear child, and *if it be as hard as a*
 “ *flint, I will make it as soft as wax; and if it be*
 “ *more foul and loathsome than dirt, I will render*
 “ *it more clear and beautiful than crystal.* My
 “ blessed servant Ignatius gave me one day power
 “ over his heart, and I did render it so chaste
 “ and strong, that he never after felt any motion
 “ of the flesh all his life. Give me your heart,
 “ my child, and tell me, in the sincerity of a
 “ true son, how much you love me, your chaste
 “ Mother? Hail Mary.”

“ O my dear Mother! I love you more than
 “ my tongue can express, and more than my
 “ very soul can conceive. And *I reverence you,*
 “ *O sacred Virgin Mary! and together with the*
 “ *Holy Trinity bless and praise you infinitely, for*

“ that you are worthy of so many praises, as
 “ none can, no not yourself, conceive. I praise
 “ and magnify you a thousand thousand times,
 “ and ten thousand times I bless that sacred
 “ womb of your’s which bore the Son of the
 “ Eternal Father. Hail Mary.”—p. 294.

Among “ various salutations and benedictions
 “ to the honour of our blessed Lady,” the 9th
 is as follows :—

“ HAIL, MARY, LADY AND MISTRESS OF THE
 “ WORLD, TO WHOM ALL POWER HAS BEEN GIVEN
 “ BOTH IN HEAVEN AND EARTH.”—p. 206.

I will not go on ; I will not wound the feelings of my Protestant readers, by producing any more of this disgusting, this polluting trash. But I call on Dr. Kelly, or any other apologist of your Church ; above all, on Dr. Milner, by whose authority these abominations profess to be set forth for the edification of the “ Faithful “ of the Midland District,” to produce, if he can, some lurking preposition, as in the former instance, some potent particle, which may rescue those who use them, and especially the Apostolic Vicar, who has sanctioned the use of them, from the charge of direct and most atrocious blasphemy.

Yet this is the religion, which we are gravely told by senators, statesmen, and reviewers, is

similar to that pure faith which is taught in our own Evangelic Church. Dr. Doyle has even the confidence to say to us, "*your belief on this very subject, on the mediation of Saints, is substantially the same as ours*; your practice should be the same; your language is *precisely the same.*" "Hear it," says he,* "from the tongue of one of your most learned bishops. Montague, Antid. p. 20, says; 'I do not deny but the Saints are mediators, as they are called, of prayer and intercession; they interpose with God by their supplications, and mediate by their prayers.'"

To this assertion of Dr. Doyle I give the most direct and indignant contradiction. Bishop Montagu's words are shamefully garbled by him; two scraps of sentences, which occur at a distance from each other, are torn from their respective contexts, and pinned together, to produce the appearance of the author's saying the very contrary to what his whole treatise expressly teaches.

In a former part of this treatise,† Montagu had expressly condemned not only the *practice* of your Church, in respect to the worship of creatures, calling it, in plain terms, impious,

* Letters of J. K. L. p. 279.

† Ricardi Montacutii Antidiatribæ, 1625, pp. 13, 19, 20, 21.

but also its *doctrine*. In the passage which Dr. Doyle makes the subject of his artifice, he says, that “to call the Saints mediators and “intercessors is what he never can admit, “except in a modified and indirect sense. I “would not deny,” says he, “that they are “mediators of prayer and intercession, as you “call it; but then it is by praying in a body “for the whole body of the Church, (universim “universos). Belonging as they do to that “community, they are solicitous for, and strive “to promote, its welfare: and they remember “well that the Church on earth is yet militant. “But *shew me, if you can, that they are mediators “for me, or you, or any other individual who is “unknown to them.*” It is in the sense which has been here explained, that he afterwards says “they interpose with God by their supplica- “tions, and mediate by their prayers.” Then in the very next page he adds, “I will now “declare to you what my opinion is in this “question, and I entreat you to examine what “I shall advance by the judgment of the ancient “fathers, and the practice of the primitive “Church. The Saints, as we call them, being “loosed from the bands of their bodily prison, “enjoy the beatific Vision of God in the highest

“ A practice made use of by St. Mechtildis.”
—p. 212, 213.

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Father, by his omnipotence, has made
“ *thee most powerful, so assist us at the hour of our*
“ *death, by defending us against all power that is*
“ *contrary to thine. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Son has endowed thee with so much
“ knowledge and charity, that it enlightens
“ all heaven, so *in the hour of our death illustrate*
“ *and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of*
“ *the true faith, that they be not perverted by*
“ *error or pernicious ignorance. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Virgin, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth
“ into thee the love of God, so *instil * into us at*
“ *the hour of death, the sweetness of divine love,*

* The following is an extract from a prayer to St. Aloysius.—
p. 348, 349.

“ Angelical youth, Aloysius, *by the particular appointment of*
“ *God's Vicar upon Earth, Patron of those who apply to stu-*
“ *dies.*” “ For the love thou hadst for Christ crucified and
“ his most blessed Mother, receive me as thy client and obedient
“ servant ; aid and assist me in the pursuit of virtue and learning ;
“ nourish and increase in me a purity of mind and manners ;
“ turn off the snares laid against my chastity ; ward and defend
“ me against the dangers of the world ; *inspire my heart with a*

“ that all bitterness at that time may become
 “ acceptable and pleasant to us. Hail Mary.

“ *Our blessed Lady herself taught St. Mechtil-*
 “ *dis the abovementioned triple salutation, promis-*
 “ *ing her certain assistance for it at the hour of*
 “ *her death.*”—p. 212, 213.

AN ANGELICAL EXERCISE.

“ I am an amiable and loving Mother, Mater
 “ amabilis, says the glorious Virgin Mary, Mo-
 “ ther of God. Will you, my dear child, do
 “ something this day in my honour? For you
 “ must know, that *I leave nothing, though of never*
 “ *so little value, unrecompensed, which is done in*
 “ *my honour*; as Troilus Savelli, a young Baron
 “ of Rome, though a great and enormous sin-
 “ ner, can well testify, who, at the end of his
 “ life, being beheaded for his wickedness, ob-
 “ tained by my favour so perfect contrition and
 “ remission of his sins, that *he died like a Saint,*
 “ *for having never failed to say once a day on his*
 “ *bare knees one Ave Maria in my honour.* I as-
 “ sure you, in the sincerity of a Mother, that at

“ *true and filial confidence in the ever blessed Virgin Mary, the*
 “ *Mother of good counsels*; govern and direct me in my choice
 “ of a state of life, and let the grace of God be my perpetual
 “ defence against all mortal sin; that assisted by thy patronage
 “ and aided by the Grace of God, &c.”

“ A practice made use of by St. Mechtildis.”
—p. 212, 213.

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Father, by his omnipotence, has made
“ *thee most powerful, so assist us at the hour of our*
“ *death, by defending us against all power that is*
“ *contrary to thine. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Son has endowed thee with so much
“ knowledge and charity, that it enlightens
“ all heaven, so *in the hour of our death illustrate*
“ *and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of*
“ *the true faith, that they be not perverted by*
“ *error or pernicious ignorance. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Virgin, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth
“ into thee the love of God, so *instil * into us at*
“ *the hour of death, the sweetness of divine love,*

* The following is an extract from a prayer to St. Aloysius.—
p. 348, 349.

“ Angelical youth, Aloysius, *by the particular appointment of*
“ *God's Vicar upon Earth, Patron of those who apply to stu-*
“ *dies.*” “ For the love thou hadst for Christ crucified and
“ his most blessed Mother, receive me as thy client and obedient
“ servant ; aid and assist me in the pursuit of virtue and learning ;
“ nourish and increase in me a purity of mind and manners ;
“ turn off the snares laid against my chastity ; ward and defend
“ me against the dangers of the world ; *inspire my heart with a*

“ that all bitterness at that time may become
 “ acceptable and pleasant to us. Hail Mary.

“ *Our blessed Lady herself taught St. Mechtild-*
 “ *dis the abovementioned triple salutation, promis-*
 “ *ing her certain assistance for it at the hour of*
 “ *her death.*”—p. 212, 213.

AN ANGELICAL EXERCISE.

“ I am an amiable and loving Mother, Mater
 “ amabilis, says the glorious Virgin Mary, Mo-
 “ ther of God. Will you, my dear child, do
 “ something this day in my honour? For you
 “ must know, that *I leave nothing, though of never*
 “ *so little value, unrecompensed, which is done in*
 “ *my honour* ; as Troilus Savelli, a young Baron
 “ of Rome, though a great and enormous sin-
 “ ner, can well testify, who, at the end of his
 “ life, being beheaded for his wickedness, ob-
 “ tained by my favour so perfect contrition and
 “ remission of his sins, that *he died like a Saint,*
 “ *for having never failed to say once a day on his*
 “ *bare knees one Ave Maria in my honour.* I as-
 “ sure you, in the sincerity of a Mother, that at

“ *true and filial confidence in the ever blessed Virgin Mary, the*
 “ *Mother of good counsels* ; govern and direct me in my choice
 “ of a state of life, and let the grace of God be my perpetual
 “ defence against all mortal sin ; that assisted by thy patronage
 “ and aided by the Grace of God, &c.”



“ A practice made use of by St. Mechtildis.”
—p. 212, 213.

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Father, by his omnipotence, has made
“ *thee most powerful, so assist us at the hour of our*
“ *death, by defending us against all power that is*
“ *contrary to thine. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Mary, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ God the Son has endowed thee with so much
“ knowledge and charity, that it enlightens
“ all heaven, so *in the hour of our death illustrate*
“ *and strengthen our souls with the knowledge of*
“ *the true faith, that they be not perverted by*
“ *error or pernicious ignorance. Hail Mary.*

“ O Holy Virgin, our Sovereign Queen ! As
“ the Holy Ghost has plentifully poured forth
“ into thee the love of God, so *instil * into us at*
“ *the hour of death, the sweetness of divine love,*

* The following is an extract from a prayer to St. Aloysius.—
p. 348, 349.

“ Angelical youth, Aloysius, *by the particular appointment of*
“ *God's Vicar upon Earth, Patron of those who apply to stu-*
“ *dies.*” “ For the love thou hadst for Christ crucified and
“ his most blessed Mother, receive me as thy client and obedient
“ servant ; aid and assist me in the pursuit of virtue and learning ;
“ nourish and increase in me a purity of mind and manners ;
“ turn off the snares laid against my chastity ; ward and defend
“ me against the dangers of the world ; *inspire my heart with a*

“ that all bitterness at that time may become
 “ acceptable and pleasant to us. Hail Mary.

“ *Our blessed Lady herself taught St. Mechtil-*
 “ *dis the abovementioned triple salutation, promis-*
 “ *ing her certain assistance for it at the hour of*
 “ *her death.*”—p. 212, 213.

AN ANGELICAL EXERCISE.

“ I am an amiable and loving Mother, Mater
 “ amabilis, says the glorious Virgin Mary, Mo-
 “ ther of God. Will you, my dear child, do
 “ something this day in my honour? For you
 “ must know, that *I leave nothing, though of never*
 “ *so little value, unrecompensed, which is done in*
 “ *my honour* ; as Troilus Savelli, a young Baron
 “ of Rome, though a great and enormous sin-
 “ ner, can well testify, who, at the end of his
 “ life, being beheaded for his wickedness, ob-
 “ tained by my favour so perfect contrition and
 “ remission of his sins, that *he died like a Saint,*
 “ *for having never failed to say once a day on his*
 “ *bare knees one Ave Maria in my honour.* I as-
 “ sure you, in the sincerity of a Mother, that at

“ *true and filial confidence in the ever blessed Virgin Mary, the*
 “ *Mother of good counsels* ; govern and direct me in my choice
 “ of a state of life, and let the grace of God be my perpetual
 “ defence against all mortal sin ; that assisted by thy patronage
 “ and aided by the Grace of God, &c.”

1796, at the very time when the news of the defeats of the French in Germany, and the higher Italy, was spread through the country. The professor of eloquence, referring to this occasion, makes the following very appropriate address to his countrymen. "The angels," says he, "who in the heights of the empyrean, worship their exalted Mistress, these very angels, to whom it is not permitted to direct a single glance to her face, envied in some sort your lot." But, whatever might be the feelings of the angels, certain it is, that "the whole population of Ancona ran to this image of the Virgin, and gave the most sincere and unequivocal signs of penitence, joy, and devotion. The Cardinal Bishop Ranuzzi shewed himself among the most eager." By his order there was published a true relation of the affair, which was known to 24,000 eye-witnesses, and authenticated by legal inquiries. An inscription was engraven in stone, and placed in the Cathedral, to perpetuate the memory of this unheard of prodigy. "On the 25th of Nember, 1796, the process was brought to a close, drawn out with the utmost rigour of form." *The Pope instituted a pious fraternity to honour the image, under the name of the Sons and Daughters of Mary.*

The author further tells us, that on the day

after the first miracle, when a solemn procession was made in its honour, the Virgin did nothing but open, and close, and turn her eyes on all sides, to the indescribable delight of the people, who absolutely wept for joy. On the 26th of June, 1800, and on the 15th of August, 1817, similar processions took place; and on the 13th of May, 1814, *Pius VII. in person, crowned the miraculous image*, an event which was consecrated by an inscription. He fixed the annual feast of the image for the second Sunday in the same month, and attached to it the power of gaining a plenary Indulgence. So many, indeed, were the Indulgences, both plenary, and partial, which were granted by Pius VI. and his successor to this Image, that Albertini is afraid of being tedious, if he should recount them.

It would, however, be great injustice to the other Images of the Virgin Mary in Italy, to suppose, that they continued idle, while their illustrious sister at Ancona was thus delighting the good people of that city. Far from it: at Rome, at Civit  Vecchia, at Macerata, at Ascoli, at Frascati, &c., &c., the Madonnas were every where on the alert, and there was an absolute rivalry and emulation in winking among these holy images. A volume is now before me, en-

titled "Official Memoirs of the Juridical Examination into the Authenticity of the Miraculous Events, which happened at Rome in the years 1796-7, including the Decree of Approbation." London, Keating and Brown, 1801. The Italian edition of these memoirs appeared "*with the official approbation and permission of the master of the Sacred Palace of the Apostles.*" Pius VI. not only instituted the juridical proceedings, and sent these "digested memoirs" in due form, to the Prince Bishop of Hildesheim, but also granted *an annual mass, with an office*, for all the Clergy of Rome, on the 9th of July; which grant, as well as another for an Indulgence, was confirmed and extended by Pius VII. It is quite impossible, therefore, to find a better instance for our purpose.

One or two specimens of these miracles will enable us to form a proper judgment of the whole; for, to say the truth, there is but little variety in the operations of the several images.

Father Christopher da Vallépietra, Lecturer of Theology in the Capuchin Convent in Rome, testifies (p.126.) on oath, that "he had made the science of optics his particular study; that he went on Sunday the 17th of July, 1796, to the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, for the

“ purpose of seeing the picture of the blessed
 “ Virgin of Guadalupe placed in that Church ;”
 that, “ after reconnoitring the exact and ordinary
 “ position of the pictorial eyes, he fixed upon a
 “ situation sufficiently near to observe the
 “ smallest occurrence, and there he made his
 “ observations: that *he had never seen the picture*
 “ *before, and therefore could not be suspected of*
 “ *any prevention in its favour ;*” (Is it possible
 to conceive more satisfactory proof of the wit-
 ness’s perfect sincerity?) “ that he continued
 “ his prayers with his eyes fixed on the ground,
 “ that they might be more fresh and certain,
 “ waiting for the moment to observe the miracle,
 “ as soon as he should receive notice from the
 “ general acclamations of the people.” It was
 not long before he heard a general cry, “ See,
 “ see, behold the Virgin !” then quickly raising
 his eyes, “ I saw,” says he, “ the laws of nature
 “ suspended ; artificial eyes painted on canvass
 “ opening ; the superior eyelids gradually and
 “ majestically ascending, so as to leave the entire
 “ pupils, and the surrounding white clearly vi-
 “ sible. They remained open at least the space
 “ of four seconds, and afterwards with the same
 “ slowness and majesty descended, and took
 “ their prior position.”—“ Each of the spec-
 “ tators, moved with the spectacle, as we may

“ easily suppose, burst into tears, and some-
 “ times into acclamations of joy, in acknow-
 “ ledgments of the favours received” (a most
 exemplary instance of pious gratitude! for
 the only favour recorded, is that of being
 permitted to see the white of the Virgin’s
 eyes); “ or manifested marks of sincere repen-
 “ tance and compunction. It was a most edi-
 “ fying spectacle, to see the lively and simple
 “ faith of these good Christians, who, as soon
 “ as the miracle ceased, would begin to invoke
 “ the most tender of mothers in these terms.
 “ ‘ Most holy Mother, permit us to see the pro-
 “ ‘ digy once more ;’ and the Holy Virgin, full of
 “ goodness and condescension, would hear their
 “ prayers and grant them this consolation, by
 “ again opening and shutting *her eyes*.”

Similar exclamations identifying the Virgin
 with her Images occur in every page.* But I
 have chosen this instance in preference to others;

* In p. 61, we meet with the following passage.

“ The witness (Alexander Clementi) was present at an
 “ event by no means uncommon on similar occasions. A
 “ robust young man, unknown to the witness, whose appear-
 “ ance seemed to speak him a mechanic, with an instantaneous
 “ emotion, as soon as he observed the miracle, threw himself on
 “ his knees in the midst of the people, and exclaimed, *Most*
 “ *holy Virgin Mary ! Thou hast been the means of my soul’s Sal-*
 “ *vation ; without this grace I must have been lost.*”

which had the sworn attestations of persons of much higher rank, in particular of the “ Marquis Paul del Buffalo, General Administrator of the Lotteries in the Pope’s States;” “ His Grace the Duke of Lante della Rovere Vaini;” “ the most illustrious Marchionesses Barbara Palombara Massimi, and Maria Resta della Torre;” “ his Eminence *Cardinal Romualdo Braschi Onesti, Nephew of Pius VI. the then reigning Pope;*” “ the most illustrious and most Rev. the Bishop of Isauria, Consultor of the sacred congregations of the Holy Office, and of the Index, Examiner of the Bishops;” “ the most illustrious and most Rev. Prelate Julius Gabrielli, a Roman Senator, Apostolic Protonotary, and *actual Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Council,*” &c. &c. I have chosen, I repeat, the instance attested by the worthy Capuchin in preference to all these, not because the facts in his case were more remarkable than in the others, nor even because of his skill in optics, but because of the very peculiar and eminently distinguished character of the picture. It is, in short, a copy of an original by the blessed Virgin herself! My readers must not startle at this intimation, for it rests on undoubted evidence, and has received the full assent and approbation of all the au-

thorities at Rome. I will subjoin, verbatim,
 the account given of it in these "Official Me-
 moirs."—"Every trait in the countenance
 seems to breathe the most tender goodness,
 and to recal to our minds the striking miracle
 to which its owes its origin, and which was
 effected at Mexico, where it has been the
 means of rendering the Church of Guadalupe
 very celebrated. In a word, it presents us
 with *an exact portrait of the Virgin Mary,*
 which in some manner may be esteemed *the*
work of her hands, according to the miracle
 which I shall here briefly relate.

"This Mother of Mercies having ordered
Giandiego di Quauhtitlan to gather upon the
Tepajacao," (what a soft but irresistible air of
 truth breathes from these transatlantic appel-
 latives!) "some roses and other flowers which
 she had miraculously produced on the spot,
 she condescended to arrange them herself
 on a coarse piece of canvass, the property
 of her devoted servant, (*Giandiego di Quauh-*
titlan,) and by a new miracle these flowers
 imprinted the beautiful portrait which may
 still be seen at Guadalupe, and which is care-
 fully preserved there as a perpetual monu-
 ment of this extraordinary favour of the Vir-
 gin, and as an object of veneration for all

“ the inhabitants of the country. A few years ago a virtuous Priest of the late Society of “ Jesus,” (what a mercy it is, that a Society whose Priests are so virtuous, and so considerate, is once more revived!) “ animated with a holy “ zeal for propagating among the faithful a due “ respect and veneration towards this miracu- “ lous portrait of the blessed Virgin, Mother of “ God, made a present of a copy taken from “ the original, by a capital artist of the modern “ school, to the Church of St. Nicholas at Rome.” Then follows a description of the portrait, with which I will not trouble my readers. I will only tell them, that those, who make haste, may yet perhaps procure, as I have done, at Messrs. Keating and Brown’s, a copy of these “ Official “ Memoirs,” where they will have (together with twenty-five others) an engraving of this *authentic likeness of the Blessed Virgin*, and may judge for themselves of “ her original and “ ravishing beauty.”

Of other instances I need not say much, though some of them are recommended by very considerable, and even permanent, effects wrought on the pictures themselves; one, in particular, hanging in Mr. Pucci’s nursery, by much additional beauty and liveliness of colouring, which still subsists, (p. 69.) and which, as

is positively attested upon oath by Mr. Pucci himself, a gentleman of independent fortune, "was not given to it from fresh varnish, or from any art or skill of man."

I have already said that there was not much variety in the action of these images; this remark, however, applies principally to those at Rome. In the provinces the case was different. At Torricella, for instance, "*a torrent of tears was observed running in a most miraculous manner from the eyes of a statue carved in wood, and representing the Blessed Virgin Mary, under the title of our Lady delle Grazie. There issued from her countenance at the same time so profuse a perspiration, that not only the Virgin's veil, but cloths applied by the faithful, were completely moistened by the same.*" p. 217. Again, in the convent of St. Liberatus, at the foot of the Appennines, a similar "miraculous perspiration was observed on the picture of the Patron Saint, which is kept within an iron grate, and above his tomb." "*This perspiration was so copious, that besides humecting the linen applied to wipe the face, it moreover wetted the tomb that was underneath.*" p. 225. At Ancona, "the letters and narrative, and the legal process, all go to prove that stupendous and unparalleled prodigies have

“ been witnessed in the picture of *St. Ann, who has her daughter, the Virgin Mary, before her, and who is teaching her to read.* On the 26th of June, the people, who had flocked thither in crowds, beheld *the pictures of the Mother and the Daughter turn their eyes towards the spectators.* In the mean time, the pupils appeared to glitter like the eyes of a living person.”—p. 215-6.

But the miracle, which strikes me the most, is that which took place at Mercatello, in the instance of “ a very antiquated picture of our Lady delle Grazie, placed on an altar in the collegiate church of that place. The countenance assumed a brilliant tint, the eyes became lively, and the lineaments, though scarcely perceptible, which several ages had effaced, again became distinct and visible. *The countenance of the infant Jesus, which the Mother held in her arms, changed colour; and several times was the Divine Infant observed to bend towards the glass which covered the picture, to signify, as it were, how acceptable was the devotion of the pious multitude that was present at the spectacle.*” I scarcely need to add, that all these statements are extracted from legal processes instituted in Episcopal, or other Ecclesiastical Courts, and duly certified as true.—p. 224.

Still, with these few exceptions in the provinces, the main occupation of the miraculous images was in winking. The effects of the miracles, as far as military operations were concerned, certainly did not answer the pious hopes of the people: the successes of the allies in Italy were very shortlived—the French again advanced, plundered the cities, wasted the country, massacred the faithful inhabitants; and the miraculous images, meanwhile, were contented with winking at all these enormities.

But vastly higher blessings resulted from them than any merely temporal advantages. "We shall here mention, once for all," I quote the Official Memoirs, "this other species of general miracle, *which was not proved in the process*, as it was a fact of general notoriety in Rome: I mean the general conversion and change of manners, the spirit of repentance, &c. Our ancestors have never beheld, and our successors, it is probable, never will behold the striking spectacle, which Rome exhibited at this ever memorable epoch." "The sacred names of *Jesus and Mary* were on every lip, and seemed to make a feast for every heart. *You would meet at every step altars erected, where the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God and man, was represented. Surrounding crowds on*

“ *their knees were incessantly soliciting her favours,*
 “ *or expressing their joy and gratitude for the*
 “ *miracle repeated before them.*” “ Rome was
 “ then a second Paradise, and all that were not
 “ strangers to the weakness of human nature
 “ would have abundant reason to rejoice, could
 “ but one half of this piety and zeal be per-
 “ petuated in a world like our’s, of sin and
 “ misery.”*—pp. 40, 41, 42.

Such is this very valuable and official state-
 ment of the *regard paid at present to images* in
 the Church of Rome. I beg my readers now
 to turn to Dr. Kelly’s evidence on the subject
 cited by me above, page 394, and see how far

* It is only fair to add the following extract, as proving that
 some permanent results have ensued from these miracles.

“ In the midst of all the miseries for which we had to
 “ reproach ourselves before God, and for which we were
 “ imploring his mercy under our accumulated tribulations,
 “ Rome, to do her justice, has constantly cultivated, and care-
 “ fully nourished, a most tender and special devotion to the
 “ glorious Queen of Heaven, Mary, Mother of God. The un-
 “ paralleled prodigies that have occurred during these latter times,
 “ have rendered this devotion a duty of the strictest obligation ;
 “ for it seems that we have thence acquired a new title to the
 “ glorious appellation of adopted children of the Blessed Virgin.”

“ Since the miracles, these paintings have been, and still
 “ are, exhibited to the public eye in every street and in every
 “ square of the metropolis, and they have received a degree of
 “ magnificence and ornament unknown to former ages.”—p. 129.

its accuracy is illustrated by what has been here detailed; particularly as far as relates to Roman Catholics attaching "no importance to them, beyond reminding them of circumstances connected with religious duties."

If it be said, that these "Memoirs" relate only to the practice of Italians, I must first remind my readers of the sanction given to the whole by the injunctions of successive Popes; and must then inform them, that such was the value ascribed to this work by the Roman Catholics of this kingdom, that in order to procure a translation of it into English, there are the names not only of many of the distinguished lay families of that communion in England among the subscribers, but also of the *four Irish Metropolitans, of a large portion of the suffragan Bishops, of three of the English Vicars Apostolic, of very many of the Clergy, especially of the Rev. J. Milner, F.S.A. Winton, for a dozen copies.**

* In connection with this subject, I beg leave to subjoin the following Extract from the Declaration set forth by the Synod of Archbishops and Bishops held in Dublin 25th Jan. 1826.

"Catholics believe that the power of working miracles has not been withdrawn from the Church of God. The belief; however, of any particular miracle not recorded in the Word of God, is not required as a term of Catholic Communion, though there are many so strongly recommended to our belief, that they cannot without temerity be rejected." p. 13.

My next subject is, I am sorry to say, the very tiresome one of

INDULGENCES.

And here I begin with acknowledging an inaccuracy in my former statement of Dr. Doyle's language.

I have said in note, page 164, of my Letters to you, "that Dr. Doyle, in the course of his "examination" (before the Committee of the House of Commons) "*never once intimates*, that "the temporal punishment, remitted by an "indulgence, extends to the pains of purgatory." This is inaccurate. In writing it, I had not adverted to a previous question which was proposed to him on this subject, and which was disjoined from the rest by several intervening particulars. In answer to that first question he said that a person "by gaining an indulgence "is thereby assisted and relieved from such "temporal punishment, as God in his justice "might inflict upon him, either in this life, or "hereafter in purgatory, previous to his admission into Heaven."*

But while I freely acknowledge my own inaccuracy, and would as freely acquit Dr. Doyle (if I could do so with sincerity) of all

* Commons, p. 193.

purpose to deceive in this particular, I feel myself compelled to add, that this is very far from being the case.

The Committee, resuming their examination on this point, (the Report of which occupies two entire folio pages,) desires Dr. Doyle to "describe the nature of an indulgence." This he does at great length; but in the course of his description not one syllable drops from him, which would imply that the temporal punishment of sin remitted by an indulgence extends at all beyond this life. The reason on which he grounds the infliction of such punishment, when actually suffered after the guilt of sin is remitted, not only does not apply to purgatory, but seems even to exclude all consideration of it, for it is inflicted, he says, "*in order that God may show to the faithful, at large, who often are scandalized by the sin, his justice as well as his mercy.*" I must here also again notice, that when the Committee expressly informed him, that they considered the temporal penalties of sin, of which he had spoken, to be such as had their effect solely in this life, he not only does not undeceive them, but says that which could only tend to confirm them in their error. But on these particulars, as I have already remarked* on

* Letters to Butler, p. 165, note.

them, I will not now enlarge. I will only add, that in his examination before the Lords three days afterwards, he still keeps the remission of the pains of Purgatory, and of all punishment beyond this world, nay, of all divinely inflicted punishment whatsoever, entirely out of sight. "The nature of an Indulgence," says he, "is a remission of the temporal punishment which may be supposed due to the sin after the guilt is remitted by Almighty God, through the Sacrament of Penance." And so successful is he for a time in this attempt, that their Lordships find it necessary on a subsequent day, to ask him, whether he assents to the statement of others, that Indulgences may have effect in remitting punishments imposed by God.*

Meanwhile, the Prelates, who were examined after him before the Commons, pursue for the most part a very similar course. Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, being asked "What is the doctrine of the Catholic Church with respect to Indulgences?" answers as follows; "The authorities of the Catholic Church have, in virtue of the power of the keys committed to them, a power to remit a *certain portion* of the temporal punishment due to sin, after the

* Lords, p. 315.

“guilt of sin has been remitted; but in no case
“can Indulgences have effect, till the person is
“first justified and reconciled with God.”*

Here we may perceive that Dr. Murray not only abstains from all mention of Purgatory, and even of divine punishments in this life, but moreover insinuates that the Church does not claim a power of remitting *all* the temporal punishments due to sin, after the guilt of it has been remitted, but only “a certain portion.” It would be interesting to know, what that “certain portion” is; and it would be still more interesting to learn, what course the Church of Rome would take with the Archbishop, if, instead of making this convenient insinuation before an Assembly of Heretics, he should venture to deny categorically, before the world, the power of the Church to grant a full remission of all the temporal punishment of sin in such cases.

He is afterwards asked more explicitly, what he considers to be the temporal punishment of sin? and he cannot but answer, that it “may be either in this world or in the next.” To a further inquiry, “whether a priest of the Roman Catholic Church by granting, or withholding an Indulgence, can avert or accelerate

* Commons, p. 226.

“ the *wrath of God*, as far as the temporary “ punishment of sin is concerned ?” he answers, “ that the authorities of the church can do so “ by the power entrusted to them by God.” But then he immediately shifts the question from the “ wrath of God” to the penances imposed by man. “ The grant of an Indulgence,” says he, “ is accompanied, as a condition for “ obtaining it, by an injunction to perform some “ act of piety ; it is a *change of punishment* from “ one species of austerity to another more “ suitable to human infirmity, a *kind of commu-
“ tation*, which commutation is admitted in the “ canons of the Protestant Church ; it is ad- “ mitted, and laid down in Burn’s Ecclesiastical “ Law, that there are such things as commuta- “ tions of penance in the Protestant Church.” —p. 229.

Now, if this “ commutation” be, (as it undeniably is in the English church) merely a change from one humanly inflicted penance to another, it has nothing to do with the “ wrath “ of God,” the point on which Dr. Murray’s answer was required by the committee. But, if it were really intended to apply to the question, then Dr. Murray is pleased to say, that an Indulgence is a “ change of punishment,” from that which God inflicts, to another imposed

by the pope, which is "more suitable to human infirmity"! The truth, however, is, that the very name, Indulgence, excludes the notion of commutation; and, accordingly, Bellarmine* says, that "it is universally agreed, that the "work enjoined for gaining the Indulgence, "need not be such as to compensate the "punishment due; for in that case, it would "not be a remission, but a commutation, or "redemption."

But the Committee are a little more sharp-sighted than usual in their examination of Dr. Murray on this point, and will not let him slip through their hands thus easily. They accordingly repeat their question in a form, which they doubtless thought would admit of no subterfuge. "Can a priest of the Roman Catholic "Church, by granting or withholding an Indul- "gence, accelerate the course of a departed "soul through Purgatory, or retard it?" Cunning, however, as they are, they are no match for this Archbishop. He answers in a manner, which leaves them almost as much in the dark respecting the object of their inquiry, as when they began with him. "It is *our belief*, that prayers "in this world are of use to accelerate the pas- "sage of the soul in Purgatory to future bliss;

* De Indulg. l. i. c. 12.

“ Indulgences, however, cannot reach beyond the present life, except as far as God may be pleased, through the merits of Christ, to accept our prayers for the release of the soul in Purgatory.”

If the answer had stopped here, it would have seemed to have been tolerably clear, and to have denied every thing like efficacy in Indulgences, beyond the prayers which may accompany them. But then it would have been downright heresy, and would have fallen under the censure pronounced against Luther by Leo X. Care, therefore, is taken by the Archbishop in what follows, to rescue himself from this predicament, and at the same time to avoid saying anything which shall apprise his learned hearers of the ingenious expedient he is adopting: “ The church,” says he, “ *has no power, by right, to grant an Indulgence for the relief of souls in Purgatory, except by way of suffrage or prayer; but our prayers, offered through Christ for that purpose, are considered to be efficacious in such a degree as is known only to God.*”

And here we have again occasion to recur to Dr. Doyle. The Committee of the Lords, having

* See Letters to Butler, p. 163.

already received that prelate's account of "the nature of an Indulgence," and finding it to fall so very far short even of this statement of Dr. Murray, think it necessary to call upon him, in a subsequent examination, to give them his opinion more explicitly. His answer is worthy of attention.

Q. "Dr. Murray has said, that a Bishop or Priest,* granting an Indulgence, or withholding it, can accelerate or retard the wrath of God, as against a sinner; do you agree in that?"

A. "Not the wrath, but the punishment, rather of God, as against a sinner. The Christian, by gaining an Indulgence, can apply, or offer that Indulgence by way of suffrage, or in the nature of a prayer to God, that God would be pleased to shorten the term of punishment, which an individual or individuals in purgatory should otherwise undergo; it is in that sense, and no other, that Dr. Murray must have spoken, for *our doctrine is very plain*, and known equally well, or perhaps better, to Dr. Murray than to me:

* I quote these words, as given in the question, though there is in them a manifest inaccuracy. A priest cannot grant an Indulgence; nor can a bishop, except for a short period.

“ *Indulgences can be applied to souls in purgatory only by way of suffrage, that is, as a prayer.*”*

Now, would not any one imagine, from this use of the words, that suffrage and prayer are synonymous, or, at most, that suffrage is a species of prayer? whereas, in truth, prayer is only one of three species of suffrage. And thus the Archbishop and his friend hope to ride quietly off, without further observation, on an opinion which has been maintained by some few divines, namely, that Indulgences are efficacious only “by way of suffrage.” It would be hardly worth while to stop them, if they had not thought fit to say, “It is *our* belief,” “*our* doctrine.” But this renders a few more words necessary, before we part with them. For, if by “*our* belief, *our* doctrine,” they mean merely to express, each in the fulness of episcopal authority, that such is the belief, or doctrine, of himself individually, it is clear they are cajoling the committee, whose inquiry is solely directed to the belief and doctrine of their *church*. If, on the other hand, they mean, as it would be reasonable to suppose, the belief and doctrine of their church, they affirm, what they cannot but know to be utterly unfounded. For they must know perfectly well, that the

* Lords, 315.

opinion, which they ascribe to their church, would be held in abomination by the great majority of divines who have treated on the subject, and is in direct contradiction to the Papal Bulls by which Indulgences are granted. It is in short, almost, or quite, heretical; and, as the Class-Book of Maynooth expressly says, it is hardly possible to rescue it from the censure pronounced by Pius V. and Gregory XIII. on one of the proscribed propositions of Baius.*

Another of the prelates examined on this subject by the Committee of the House of Commons is Dr. Oliver Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam; he is pleased to cut down the doctrine of Indulgences still lower. He declares, with perfect gravity, that what is meant by the temporal punishment of sin remitted by an Indulgence, is no other than the penance enjoined: "You say the Church has the power of removing the temporal punishment due to sin; *by that you mean the penance enjoined?*"—"Yes."† And with this statement the Committee are quite contented. They do not trouble him with a single inquiry, to elicit the reasons of the difference of his statement from that of his Right Reverend brethren, as well as from the common notions of the world respecting

* Delahogue de Pœn. 332.

† Commons, 242.

Roman Indulgences. Apparently, they do not even perceive any difference; or, at least, they are not so impolite as to hint it to the parties themselves. In truth, their inquisitorial functions are uniformly displayed in the mildest and blandest manner, while they have a Roman Catholic divine before them; but no sooner is a presbyter of the Established Church "called in," than he is subjected to the most rigid, I had almost said, vexatious cross-examination.* I am glad that it was so; for it has only contributed to make the triumph of truth the more illustrious. But if the Honourable and Right

* I must refer to one specimen, chiefly on account of the admirable firmness and dignity, with which Mr. Phelan maintained his own ground, and corrected his Right Hon. inquisitor. See Report of Commons, 534—540. In the course of this cross-examination, we meet with one question, which proves that an acquaintance with the doctrine or liturgy of his own church forms no part of the qualifications necessary to constitute a parliamentary investigator of the difference of the two creeds. "*Is there not preserved in the Collect on one of our Saint-days, a request that the Angels may pray for us?*" Of this question, I scruple not to avow my firm conviction, that it was not the spontaneous growth of the Right Hon. gentleman's own mind, but was planted there by some foreign hand:—it was, probably, part of the brief which he received from his Roman Catholic clients. How much more of the knowledge displayed in that Committee proceeded from the same source, I do not presume to guess.

Honourable gentlemen, who formed this Committee, can look back with perfect self-complacency on the recorded difference of treatment observed towards the ministers of the two churches respectively, I do not much envy them their feelings.

But to return to the matter in hand. Having exhibited the several statements given by the Roman Catholic prelates of the doctrine respecting Indulgences, I will now inform any member of the Committee, who may do me the honour of reading these pages, what is really the doctrine on this subject taught by the Roman Catholic church,—nay, taught authoritatively at the present day by that church *in Ireland*, in the very country where these prelates preside. I shall do this, not in my own words, but in the words of the Class-Book of Maynooth. They are as follows—

“ Indulgences remit, *even in God's forum*, the
“ debt of temporal punishment which would else
“ remain to be satisfied, either in this life or in
“ purgatory, after the remission of the guilt of
“ sin; *they derive their efficacy from the treasure*
“ *of the Church*, which treasure consists, prima-
“ rily, of the merits and satisfactions of Christ;
“ for as a single drop of his blood was sufficient
“ for the redemption of the sins of the whole

“ world, there remains an infinite hoard of his
 “ merits at the disposal of the church for the
 “ service of her children ; and, secondarily, of
 “ the merits and satisfactions of the Virgin Mary
 “ and other Saints, *who underwent far severer*
 “ *sufferings than their own sins required ; which*
 “ *superabundance, and almost superfluity, of suffer-*
 “ *ings of their's, forms a sort of bank or deposit,*
 “ *out of which the Church may make disbursements*
 “ *for the common benefit of the faithful in the way*
 “ *of payment (viâ solutionis) for the punishments*
 “ *or satisfactions due from them.*”*

“ There is no reason why this should not be
 “ done for the dead as well as for the living ;
 “ the church offering to God, by the *method of*
 “ *compensation* (per modum compensationis)
 “ payment for them *out of the satisfactions of*
 “ *Christ and the Saints.*”†

All this, I say, is taught as the only sound doctrine in the Class-book at Maynooth ; and, in saying so, I hereby defy all the Irish Roman Catholic prelates (whatever they may have sworn before the Lords, or affirmed before the Commons) to contradict me.

* “ Hæc satisfactionum affluentia penes Ecclesiam manere merito censetur, instar alicujus depositi, quod in publicam fidelium utilitatem impendi possit, viâ solutionis pro illorum debitia.” — *Delahogue de Penitentia*, p. 334.

† Ibid. p. 351.

To illustrate and exemplify the accuracy of this doctrine, I subjoin some passages of the Bull of "Indiction for the Universal Jubilee;" in last year.

"During this year, which we truly call the
 "acceptable time, and the time of Salvation,"
 &c. "We have resolved, in virtue of the autho-
 "rity given to us by Heaven, fully to unlock
 "that sacred Treasure, composed of the merits, suf-
 "ferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of
 "his Virgin Mother, and of all the Saints, which
 "the author of human salvation has entrusted to
 "our dispensation." "We proclaim that the
 "year of atonement and pardon, of redemption
 "and grace, of remission and indulgence, is
 "arrived; in which we know, that those bene-
 "fits which the old law, the messenger of
 "things to come, brought every fiftieth year
 "to the Jewish people, are renewed in a much
 "more sacred manner by the accumulation of
 "spiritual blessings, through Him by whom
 "came peace and truth." "During which year
 "of the Jubilee we mercifully give and grant in
 "the Lord a plenary indulgence, remission, and
 "pardon of all their sins, to all the faithful of
 "Christ, truly penitent and confessing their sins
 "and receiving the holy communion, who shall
 "visit the churches of blessed Peter and Paul,

“ &c., and shall pour forth their pious prayers
 “ to God for the exaltation of the Church, the
 “ extirpation of heresies,* concord of Catholic
 “ princes, and the safety and tranquillity of Chris-
 “ tian people.”

I will conclude with a passage which I venture particularly to recommend to the attention of the Archbishops and Bishops, whose answers to the Parliamentary Committees we have just been contemplating.

“ But you, venerable brethren, Patriarchs,
 “ Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, co-operate
 “ with these our cares and desires.” “ *To you
 “ it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power
 “ of Indulgences; what is their efficacy, not only
 “ in the remission of the canonical penance, but also
 “ of the temporal punishment due to divine justice
 “ for sin; and what succour is afforded out of this
 “ heavenly treasure, from the merits of Christ and
 “ his Saints, to such as have departed real penitents
 “ in God’s love, yet before they had duly satisfied,
 “ by fruits worthy of penance, for sin of com-
 “ mission and omission, and are now purifying*

* In p. 187. of the former edition of my Letters to Mr. Butler, the word *heretics* stands instead of *heresies*. It was so in the Newspaper from which I copied the extract I there gave. I have since obtained a copy of the “*Laity’s Directory for 1825,*” in which the Bull is given at length.

“ *in the fire of purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admitted. Courage and attention, venerable Brethren; for some there are, following that wisdom which is not from God, and covering themselves under the clothing of sheep,—under the usual pretence of a more refined piety, are now sowing amongst the people erroneous comments on this subject.*”

Such is the language of the Bull, establishing the Jubilee of last year. But respecting this Jubilee a remarkable fact is discovered in the course of the examination of Dr. Magaurin, Roman Catholic bishop of Ardagh, before the Committee of the House of Commons. Q: “ This is a year of Jubilee in the Roman Catholic church?”—A. “ *I believe so.*” Q. “ Do the orders that have been issued from the Pope, with respect to the celebration of that Jubilee extend to Ireland?”—A. “ *No.*” Q. “ *Why is Ireland excepted?*”—A. “ *I do not know.*”*

This sounds very strange. The Bull is addressed, “ *To all the faithful of Christ who shall see these presents, health and apostolical benediction.*” In the course of it, the Holy Father is pleased to say, “ *Let the earth hear the words of our mouth, and let the whole world joyfully*

* Commons, p. 282.

“hearken to the voice of the priestly trumpet
“sounding forth to God’s people the Sacred
“Jubilee.” And yet Ireland, the land of
Saints, the strongest hold of pure Catholicity,
Dr. Magaurin tells us, is, for some unknown reason,
excepted! Surely, when one considers the
inestimable value of the great spiritual boon
conferred in a Jubilee, an exclusion from all
share in it is an infinitely greater hardship
on that persecuted and oppressed people, than
that Mr. O’Connell should not wear a silk
gown, or Mr. Shiel be eligible to a seat in
parliament. I was almost prepared, therefore,
to see the zeal and energy of the revived Association
directed into a new channel; and instead
of wasting their breath by hopelessly contending
for temporal favours which have been so often re-
fused them, vindicating at Rome their claims to
an equal share of spiritual privileges with the
rest of the faithful throughout the world. But
Dr. Doyle, in his re-examination before the
Lords, has let in a small portion of light on
this matter. He tells us, with but very little
consideration, I am sorry to observe, for the
credit of his Right Reverend brother, that *the
orders from the Pope for the celebration of the
Jubilee did extend to Ireland,—that Ireland was
not excluded from a share in the benefits of that*

precious instrument by the Pope, but by their own bishops, who *had* reasons for their decision: though one of the number, Dr. Magaurin thought fit to tell his examiners that he did not know them.

All this, I repeat, is let out by Dr. Doyle in the following brief communication to the Lords. Q. "Has the Encyclical Letter of the Pope, "respecting the Jubilee to be held this year in "Rome, been published in Ireland?"—A. "No; "we received it, but we did not think it proper to "publish it."*

It is a little to be lamented, that the curiosity of their lordships did not extend so far as to ask, *why* the Roman Catholic prelates did not think proper to publish it. For, in the absence of all information on this subject, any plain man, who considers the invaluable blessing of which the people of Ireland were thus deprived by an act of their own hierarchy, must regard it as the most extraordinary, the most astounding, exercise of episcopal discretion ever heard of; provided always, that the prelates believe the doctrine of the church to which they belong. The only imaginable reason, which occurs to one not in the secret, is this; that it was thought convenient, with reference to the parliamentary

* Lords, 315.

examinations and discussions, which were about to ensue, that no such instrument as the Bull of Indiction should be adducible.

There remains one minor point, which would not be worth remarking, except as it shews how far deserving of credit Dr. Doyle's statement is, whenever it suits him to extenuate the doctrines or the practices of his church. Being asked "What is the utmost extent, in point of duration, of an Indulgence?"—he is pleased to answer, "I believe seven years; there were many fictitious or forged Indulgences (crowds of which were carried about the world, and which were not at all authentic) for, I believe, a greater number of years; but *we do not recognize, and have not, that I know of, ever recognized any Indulgence for a period beyond that of seven years, when time is at all specified.*"*

Now, in one of the common books of popular devotion, I find a distinct mention of Indulgences of ten years;† nay, in the Class Book at Maynooth, Indulgences of seven, *twenty, &c.* years are expressly recognized;‡ this &c. evidently admitting an indefinite number, ex-

* Report of Commons, p. 195.

† Devotion, &c. of Sacred Heart, p. 365.

‡ De Pœn. p. 342.

cept that Indulgences of "many thousand years are there treated as most likely to be fictitious.

I have now before me an engraved portrait of the Virgin Mary's foot, taken from her true shoe, recently published in Italy, conferring, by authority of John XXII. and Clement VIII. an Indulgence of three hundred years, on all who shall kiss it three times, and recite thereupon three Ave Marias.

ABSOLUTION.

The next subject on which I will remark, is the evidence given on the subject of *Absolution*.

Dr. Doyle is asked by the Committee of the House of Commons,* "What is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church respecting Absolution?" an inquiry which he answers thus:

"The doctrine of the Roman Catholic church is *precisely the same* as that of the Established Church in this kingdom; so much so, that the words of Absolution, which we use, are precisely those put down in the Visitation of the Sick in the Common Prayer Book, to be used by a clergyman of the Established Church when he visits a person who wishes to confess his sins. *Our doctrine then is*, that the sinner, feeling that he may *in his lifetime* have trans-

* Report, p. 193.

“ gressed the law of God, and being penitent
“ for it, acknowledges his fault to a priest, as to
“ a minister of God, and being sincerely sorry
“ within him for having so offended God, by
“ transgressing his law, the priest, by a power
“ derived from God, gives him absolution or
“ pardon; always requiring of him, that he do
“ every thing in his power by amendment of
“ life, to satisfy for his past offences, and if he
“ should have injured his neighbour in person,
“ character, or property, that he repair such
“ injury to the full extent of his power.”

I will here wave all remark on the different meaning with which the same form of words is used by our church, in the office of the “ Visitation of the Sick,” and will only take the liberty of referring my readers to what I have said on this subject in pages 210—216 of my Letters to you.

But, even if we used those words in the same sense as the ministers of the church of Rome, if we pronounced absolution as actually conferred by us, and not merely declared, still Dr. Doyle’s assertion of the identity of the doctrine of the two churches in this particular, is so entirely inconsistent with the truth, that I cannot but give to it the most unqualified and indignant contradiction. Dr. Doyle knows

perfectly well that, according to the church of Rome, absolution is the gracious effect wrought by the sacrament of Penance, of which sacrament the words of the priest, "I absolve thee," &c. are the form: that this sacrament is pronounced to be so essential to salvation, that no man can receive pardon for mortal sin committed after baptism without it; that not to have recourse to it *once, at least, in every year** is itself a mortal sin; for no degree of penitence, no hatred of sin, no humbleness or brokenness of heart, no fervor of love towards the Almighty Being, whose law he has violated, no change of heart and life, will be accepted as true contrition without recourse to penance, in other words, without dependence on the priest; above all he knows, what above all he was anxious to suppress, that a full and particular confession of every sin, with all the circumstances which may change its nature, must then be made; that, at least, once in every year, therefore, every faithful son of the church, under the penalty of mortal sin, must, in the language of the Council of Trent, stand as a criminal before the priest's tribunal, and there await his sentence as the sentence of a divinely commissioned judge. Nay, Dr. Doyle also knows, that so little real

* Yet Dr. Doyle talks of "*his lifetime.*"

accordance is there between the two churches on this subject, that the only time when a special confession is not required as necessary for absolution by the church of Rome, is exactly that at which alone the same form of absolution* is prescribed indeed by the Church of England to be given, but *after a special confession of sins,—namely, at the Visitation of the Sick.* For thus does the Roman ritual enjoin, “If in the course of confession, or even before it begin, the sick man’s *voice and speech fail him*, let the priest endeavour to become acquainted, as far as possible, by *nods and signs*, with the sins of the penitent, which being known to him, whether generally or specially, or even *if the sick man shew the desire of confessing, whether by himself, or by others, he must be absolved.*”

All this Dr. Doyle knows full well, and all this he has purposely withholden. Even when the Committee, astonished probably to find how harmless the bugbear of absolution appeared

* It is right to add here a few words more, which the Roman Ritual requires to be used with this form; “May the suffering of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of all the Saints, whatever of good thou hast done, and of evil thou hast endured, be to thee for remission of sins, for increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen.”

when stripped of its ideal horrors by their new oracle, yet not able at once to silence all their former prejudices, venture to ask, "Is there *any* difference between the doctrine of the Catholic church and that of the Protestant church, with respect to absolution?" This most veracious divine, this witness, whose honour and integrity, as well as talents, have been so loudly applauded in the English House of Commons, scruples not to say, "*I really know of none.*" Nay, even this is not all. With an affectation of candour more disgusting than all that has preceded, he adds, "I am sure the Established Church requires, as we do, that the person making a confession of his sin be sorry or contrite for it; the words which the priest of the Established Church uses, are precisely those which we use; so I see no difference between the one and the other."

Surely an honest man may be pardoned if he feels, and if he expresses what he feels, some warmth of indignation on witnessing disingenuousness so shameless, yet unhappily so successful: if, too, he avows the pain and mortification with which he has seen a Committee of British senators voluntarily erecting themselves into a Board of Theological Inquiry, and yet incapable of eliciting the smallest spark

of true evidence on the most notorious, the most common-place, of all the corruptions of the church of Rome.

Before I leave this part of Dr. Doyle's examination before the Commons, I must refer to another particular, which demands some consideration.

Q. "Are there any cases reserved to the special jurisdiction of the See of Rome itself?" A. "*I believe not; there is no case whatever, that I know of, from which the Bishop in this country has not the power to absolve. How the Pope treats the matter in his own territory, or in Italy, I cannot say.*"—p. 196.

That the most learned prelate in Ireland should speak with so much uncertainty respecting a most important article of the powers of his own order, may well excite some surprise; and this surprise is increased, when we refer to the following very strong passage in the 14th session, c. 7. (de casuum reservatione) of the Council of Trent. After stating that the absolution given by a priest, where he has no ordinary delegated authority, is invalid, the Council thus proceeds: "But it has been the judgment of our most Holy Fathers, that it is of great moment to Christian discipline, that from certain more atrocious and grievous crimes no Absolution should be given, except by the highest priests

“ *only*; whence the Popes, with good reason,
“ and in conformity to the supreme authority
“ handed down to them in the church, have
“ derived their power of *reserving some more*
“ *grievous cases of crimes to their own peculiar*
“ *judgment.*”

Now the real force of these words is, not merely that the Popes have the power of reserving from time to time, if they think proper, certain cases to themselves; but that *there is a standing reservation of certain cases, (especially of HERESY,) the origin and authority of which are here stated.* This is clear not only from the language of the Council itself, but also from the ancient and notorious practice of the church of Rome, a practice which is distinctly recognized in the following passage of a brief of Pius VII. dated 27th of February, 1809, and addressed to the cardinals, bishops, and capitulary vicars of *France*; “ We should
“ be sorry (and we would not even conjecture
“ such a thing except on very grave reasons)
“ that any of the bishops of France have excused
“ themselves from asking of the Holy See a
“ prolongation of these powers, from their
“ having embued themselves with the *perverse*
“ *and infinitely dangerous opinion, that by virtue*
“ *of their rights they were authorized to absolve and*
“ *dispense in all the cases which the ordinances of*

“ *councils, the decrees of the Sovereign Pontiffs, have generally reserved to the power of the Bishop of Rome, after the usage constantly followed even to this day in the Universal Church. Let them examine, if (which God forbid) they have arrogated to themselves these powers; what are the outrages of which they have rendered themselves guilty.*”*

Then follows an Indult granting to the Archbishop and Bishops of France, for a term of five years only, the following among other powers, that, *as delegates of the Apostolic See, and in every act making express mention of this Apostolic Indult, they may “absolve from heresy externally manifested, provided that it be not a case of heretics setting forth (dogmatisant) their heresies publicly,”* (for no power is given them to absolve in such a case,) “*from apostasy from the faith, and from schism, after a suitable abjuration made,*” &c.

Upon this view of the doctrine, or discipline of the Church of Rome, it is obvious to ask Dr. Doyle, whether he and his brethren, the Prelates of Ireland, have received from the Pope similar, I ought to say *greater*, powers; for these, we see, expressly include a reservation.

* “Correspondance authentique de la Cour de Rome avec la France.”—p. 159.

If they *have*, why did he not acquaint the committee with the fact, in order that they might form their judgment of the nature of powers, derived from a foreign source, and liable to be withdrawn at any time? If they *have not*, (as I frankly avow my full conviction, that they have not,) how does he reconcile his statement with the truth? Will he resolve the whole into his own ignorance, on a subject most intimately connected with his episcopal functions? That is hardly possible.

In the Report of Dr. Doyle's Evidence on the subject of Confession and Absolution before the committee of the other house, (as might be expected,) we are not shocked with any such display on the part of his examiners. They limit their inquiry to the possibility of disclosures being made by the priests of crimes communicated to them in confession; and Du Thou's authority is quoted for the fact of such disclosures having been permitted in France. Dr. Doyle answers, (p. 245) "I would not believe, on the authority of Du Thou, nor any authority whatever, that it could have been allowed; for we hold universally, in the Catholic Church, that the revealing of any secrets confided to the priests in confession,

“ is contrary to the law of nature, and to the
“ authority of God ; in respect of which, no
“ Pope or council can dispense or exercise any
“ authority, except to enforce such law.”

I do not question the sincerity of Dr. Doyle in delivering this opinion : but I think it right to state, in confirmation of the accuracy of Du Thou, (an historian whose candour and caution are of themselves no ordinary vouchers for the truth of what he affirms,) that a similar instance is recorded by Gregorio Leti, in his *Life of Sixtus V.* He tells us, that that Pontiff, after he had succeeded to the Papal Chair, availed himself, in many cases, of the secrets formerly confided to him in the confessional, at a time when his great sanctity had rendered him the most popular confessor in Rome. He kept a register of these matters, and not only brought many persons to justice for crimes which had been so communicated to himself ; but he likewise sent for the oldest confessors, and required them to communicate to him whatever crimes had been confessed to them. Several complied ; and Leti justifies the proceeding by the necessity of the times.*

Need I refer to the suspicions so generally entertained of the use made by the Jesuits of

* Par. II. lib. iv. p. 285. 288.

the knowledge of state secrets acquired in the same way ?

I must not quit Dr. Doyle on the subject of confession, without noticing an extraordinary declaration which he makes in his second examination before the House of Lords.

Having stated the religious obligation under which the Roman priesthood is placed, of never divulging what is communicated to them in confession, he is reminded, that Roman Catholics are called upon, in their oath of allegiance, to swear that they will make known to his Majesty any treason, or treasonable designs, which they may know to be meditated against him. "From what you have now said," their Lordships proceed, "you could not take such an oath?"* His answer is one of the most curious, and, at the same time, most instructive imaginable. "*As our rite of confession is known to the laws,* and our doctrines "with regard to it universally acknowledged "to exist in our church, the oath which binds "us to discover any treason, which may come "to our knowledge, does not oblige us to "reveal any thing with which we may become "acquainted in sacramental confession; that

* Lords, 309.

“ is the manner in which we understand the
“ clause of the oath.”*

The first observation, which arises on this answer, is, that neither their rite of confession, nor any doctrine connected with it, are at all known to the laws of England, that the followers of Johanna Southcote, or any one of the most insignificant sects that can be named, have just as good a right to set up a pretence that they are recognized by law.

But, secondly, the oath required by the act of the 13th and 14th of Geo. III. does not only state that the person who takes it, “ will do his
“ utmost endeavour to disclose and make
“ known to his Majesty, and his heirs, all trea-
“ sons and traitorous conspiracies which may
“ be formed against him ;” but it further says, what we have over and over again been told, is alone a prodigious security for the strictest possible observance of this oath ; “ and *I do*
“ *solemnly, in the presence of God, and his only*
“ *son Jesus Christ my Redeemer, profess, testify,*
“ *and declare, that I do make this declaration, and*

* It is very remarkable, when taken in conjunction with what Dr. Doyle has here said, that the Dublin Synod, in their Declaration just set forth, giving an abstract of the oath of allegiance taken by Roman Catholics, (p. 17.) omit all mention of the obligation to disclose all traitorous conspiracies which may come to their knowledge.

“ every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever,” &c.

Now, if after this most solemn, most awful declaration, Dr. Doyle, or any other Roman Catholic, when reminded of his oath of allegiance, may turn short round, and say, “ there are certain doctrines of my church at variance with the terms of this oath, and as the law must know that there are such, the oath cannot bind us in opposition to them,”—What is to become of any oaths whatever, that may be devised for these religionists? I am not putting an idle question, but one that has a direct and immediate bearing on a most important fact. All the clergy benefited in the Church of Rome, have taken an oath that they “ acknowledge that church to be the mother and mistress of all churches, and promise and swear true obedience to the Pope, Vicar of Jesus Christ, and that all things delivered and defined by the holy canons and general councils, they do unhesitatingly receive and confess, and that they condemn and reject all things contrary thereto.” Every bishop, in addition to this, swears that he will assist the pope in retaining and defending the royalties (regalia) of St. Peter, against any man (*salvo meo ordine*); that

he will take care to defend, augment, and advance the rights, honours, privileges and
 “ authority of the holy Roman Church, of his
 “ Lord the Pope, and his successors aforesaid ;
 “ that he will observe, to the utmost of his
 “ power, and will cause to be observed by
 “ others, the rules of the holy Father’s decrees,
 “ ordinances, *reservations*, provisions, and apos-
 “ tolic commands ; that he will render to
 “ the Pope an account of his pastoral office,
 “ and of all things pertaining to the state of
 “ his church, and the discipline of his clergy
 “ and people, and will thereupon receive, with
 “ all humility, the Pope’s apostolic mandates,
 “ and execute them with the utmost diligence.”*

How, I ask, are we to know, that the demands imposed by these oaths will never interfere with what the law of the land regards as the duty of good subjects ? But if they should, have not those, who take them, as good a right to say in that case, as in this of confession :
 “ the oath of allegiance does not bind me
 “ where my oath to the Pope interferes, be-
 “ cause it is contrary to the doctrines of my
 “ church, which doctrines your law cannot but
 “ know, and since it knows, cannot but
 “ respect ?” Is our common sense to be insulted with that mockery of a security in-

* Lords, 258.

serted at the conclusion of the last oath by Pius VI. "These things I will keep the more
 " inviolably, because I know that there is no-
 " thing contained in them which can conflict
 " with the fidelity *due* to the King?"

In passing from the evidence of Dr. Doyle to what was stated by other divines on confession and absolution, I shall confine myself to Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

That prelate, in his examination before the Commons, instead of confirming what Dr. Doyle had told them, instead of saying that the doctrine of the two churches is "*precisely the same,*" volunteers an enumeration of the demands which the church of Rome makes on the penitent, beyond any other church whatsoever. "We require," says he, "all that every
 " other christian denomination requires for the
 " remission of sins ; that is, sincere and *intense*
 " repentance, including a purpose of future
 " amendment ; and we require further, the
 " additional humiliation of confession, the re-
 " ceiving of absolution from the proper autho-
 " rity, and an intention to practise such peni-
 " tential works as may be enjoined, or as the
 " nature of the sin may require."*

* Commons, p. 226.

This difference between the two prelates it is not for me to adjust or explain. I am at present engaged with Dr. Murray : but of all the particulars here recounted by him, the only one, on which I shall remark, is the “ *intense repentance,*” which he describes in glowing terms as synonymous with that “ *contrition by which the heart is changed.*”

It appears that on the examination of Mr. Phelan, that gentleman had let in a little new light on the committee, by mentioning *attrition*, as a substitute for contrition, (it is called by the Council of Trent, imperfect contrition); and attrition is described by him as “ *signifying a sorrow for sin, arising merely out of a consideration of the punishment which may be annexed to it; and this feeling,*” he says, “ *is at present admitted by the highest authority in the Church of Rome, as entitling to absolution.*”*

Now this, it will be readily perceived, relaxes very considerably the *intensity* of the repentance of which Dr. Murray has spoken. This prelate, therefore, being on a subsequent day called in, (apparently for the purpose of doing away the effect of certain parts of the evidence of the Protestant divines,) is asked,

* Commons, p. 491.—See also Letters to Butler, p. 197.

among other matters, about "attrition."* But, unfortunately, he is quite unable to contradict Mr. Phelan's description of it. Here, then, we have at last Dr. Murray's "*intense* repentance;" it is, in other words, "the fear of Hell."

But in this second examination of Dr. Murray, another very remarkable particular occurs, which must not be passed without notice.

Q. "Does not the Council of Trent require, " as a necessary means of *justification* on the " part of a sinner, that he be moved by divine " grace, repent for his sins, and detest them ; " that he should hope for pardon through the " merits of Jesus Christ, and begin to love God, " as the fountain of all justice?"—A. "*Most undoubtedly.*" Q. "Can any doctrine inconsistent with that be taught in your church, " without incurring the guilt of error?"—A. "Certainly not."—p. 653.

I beg leave to premise most sincerely, that I mean not to treat the Committee of the House of Commons, nor any member of it, with the slightest disrespect, when I venture to state, that the former of these questions can have proceeded only from a very grievous, but at the same time very natural, blunder. To own the

* Commons, p. 654.

truth, I have no doubt whatever, that the examiner, be he who he may, was duped by some plausible, but disingenuous, informant, who put these words into his mouth, without giving him to understand the real case to which they are applicable. For the question is conceived in terms most remarkably accordant, almost, indeed, verbatim the same, with the language of the Council of Trent, and must have been devised by some one much better acquainted with that Council, than the Committee has shown itself in any other instance, or could, in truth, be expected to be. But, after all, the *justification* for which the Council of Trent makes these requisitions, is the justification given in *baptism*.* Nothing could be more accurate than the citation of the words of the Council, if *that* justification were the subject of inquiry. But the matter, on which the Committee were employed, was the mode of obtaining, in the church of Rome, *remission of sin* committed *after* baptism; of such sin, in short, as is the subject of *sacramental confession*. And I am quite sure, that if the Committee had substituted, in their question, the phrase *remission of sin*, instead of *justification*, Dr. Murray must have given them a very different answer.

* Con. Trid. sess. vi. cap. 6.

He would not have dared to say, that the Council of Trent *most undoubtedly* requires, as a necessary means (or condition) of such remission of sin on the part of a sinner, “that he be moved by divine “ grace, repent for his sins, *and detest them*; that “ he should hope for pardon through the merits “ of Jesus Christ, and *begin to love God, as the “ fountain of all justice.*”

The Council of Trent requires no detestation of sin, no love of God, as necessary. Attrition, proceeding either from consideration of the turpitude of sin, or from the fear of Hell, if it excludes the present will of sinning, and be accompanied with the hope of pardon, is sufficient with the sacrament of penance.

It is true, that the Class-book of Maynooth argues that there must be an *initial love* of God, (the nature of which I have explained in page 200 of my Letters to you): but so far is even that book from saying that this is *most undoubtedly* true, that it cites a long passage from (one of the most learned, as well as most exemplary, of all your Pontiffs) Benedict XIV. of which the following is an abstract; “ Before “ the Council of Trent, the attrition, necessary “ to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of “ penance, was commonly described by divines “ as not altogether separated from, at least, some

“ slender, feeble, initial love of God. The
“ Dominicans, Vittoria and Soto, first taught
“ that *servile attrition*, that which arises *solely*
“ *from the fear of Hell*, provided the penitent
“ believes it to be contrition, is sufficient. This
“ opinion was followed by Melchior Canus, who
“ extended it even to servile attrition, when
“ known by the party himself to be such, that
“ is, to be not true contrition: and Melchior
“ Canus’s judgment was no sooner made public,
“ than it spread through all the schools, and
“ was eagerly adopted by a great majority of
“ divines, and those of the highest reputation;
“ some of the wiser and more learned among
“ them subscribed to this opinion, at first, with
“ great caution, but their successors, confident
“ in the number of those who maintain it, have
“ not only affirmed it without any doubt or limi-
“ tation, but have not scrupled to brand the
“ contrary opinion *with a formal censure*, as
“ *utterly improbable, dangerous, and implicitly and*
“ *virtually proscribed by the Council of Trent.*”*

In addition to this testimony, I must cite a decree of Alexander VII. dated 5th May, 1667, stating in express terms, that “ the more common opinion is that, which denies the

* Delahogue, Pœn. p. 101.

“ necessity of any love of God in attrition, to obtain the grace of God in the Sacrament of Penance,” and forbidding any one to decry it by any injurious or offensive expression. It forbade also the condemning the contrary opinion, (that some act of the love of God is necessary,) “ before the Holy See shall have decided.”* The Holy See has since decided in the Bull “ Unigenitus” (admitted to be valid in Ireland) *condemning sixteen propositions* (forty-four to fifty-eight inclusive) *which*, in different terms and in various degrees, *affirmed the necessity of the love of God*. Lastly, the Declaration of the recent Synod at Dublin, (p. 15,) describes the qualifications for absolution in such a manner, as excludes the necessity of any love of God.

So much for this unlucky blunder of the Committee, and the prompt and ingenious use made of it by Dr. Murray.

I will not dwell longer on the evidence given by him and his brother prelates on the subject of confession and absolution (though I might easily find matter for more than one discussion); but will conclude what I have to say on this point with the following important sworn testi-

* *Recueil Historique des Bulles, &c. Mons. 1697. p. 254.*

mony, given before the Lords by the Rev. John Burnett, a dissenting minister, resident at Cork, whose good sense, candour, and moderation, as exhibited before both Committees, entitle him to higher praise than I can presume to offer.

“ There are Catholic books in general circulation in the country, that are subversive of every first principle of morality and religion. It is well known by the priesthood, that those books are in circulation; they could prevent their circulation, as they prevent, in a great degree, the circulation of the scriptures. They have never, so far as I have been able to learn, made any attempt to prevent their circulation.”—p. 469. “ One book is the Cord of St. Francis; the Scapular is another. There are numbers of Books of Orders, as they are called, which prescribe certain prayers to be repeated, called acts of faith, acts of charity, acts of hope, and acts of contrition; they prescribe certain forms to be gone through in their devotions, and they connect with these prayers and these forms speedy release from purgatory. The lower order of the Roman Catholics believe this, and feel and act upon the belief of it; the effect of which is, that *no Roman Catholic of the lower orders has any dread of final perdition. I have spoken with them frequently on the subject, and never found*

“ *one of them that supposed he could go to Hell.*
“ If they die in mortal sin, their doctrine is,
“ that they must go to perdition; if, however,
“ they apply to the priest for absolution, he
“ must give it; and in the case of absolution,
“ which is administered on their professing a
“ regret for their sins, they go only to purga-
“ tory; and they depend on those Books of Or-
“ ders for their release from it; and hence the
“ punishments of futurity, in their estimation,
“ are only temporary punishments; and this
“ conviction has a very injurious effect upon
“ the views and feelings and conduct of the
“ people. It is easy to make a profession of re-
“ gret for sin, and to repeat prescribed prayers,
“ and to rely upon Books of Orders; and on
“ these professions, prayers, and books, the
“ Catholics do rely, instead of following the
“ general principles of morality, and taking a
“ rational and enlightened view of the religion
“ of revelation.”*

“ The influence of Catholicity in Ireland might
“ be extended very materially through the me-
“ dium of confession; there is no feeling or
“ thought entertained by the people, that they
“ would withhold from the priest in confession,
“ if he chose to interrogate them; it is a medium
“ through which every species of information

* Lords, p. 470.

“ could be obtained by the priesthood; and any
 “ use, injurious or otherwise, to the community
 “ or individuals, could be made of the informa-
 “ tion so received from the people. *The confi-*
 “ *dence of the people in their absolution, which*
 “ *follows confession, is such as completely to de-*
 “ *stroy in their minds any fear of future punish-*
 “ *ment.* I have found this to be the case gene-
 “ rally; and in cases where they are convicted
 “ in courts of justice, they very seldom show any
 “ thing like a feeling sense of their situation,
 “ which, I conceive, arises solely from the con-
 “ viction that the absolution enjoyed at the
 “ hands of the priest will do every thing for
 “ them. *I have seen, myself, thirty-five indivi-*
 “ *duals in the dock together, sentenced to death, and*
 “ *I could not perceive the least degree of emotion*
 “ *in consequence of the pronouncing of sentence, all*
 “ *which I attributed to the confidence placed in the*
 “ *absolution of the Clergy.*”*—Ibid.

* In the Eighty-fifth Number of the Edinburgh Review, recently published, it is affirmed with all gravity, that “ *the doctrines of the Catholic Church, as to absolution, confession, and penance, are laid down in the Common Prayer Book in the same words as they are described in the Catholic Books.*”—p. 129.

It will hardly be expected, after what has been already said, that I should waste the time of my readers and myself, by exposing the utter ignorance which dictated this statement. Ig-

I must now touch on a particular brought forward before the Committees, which was not treated in any of my Letters to you.

THE PROHIBITION OF THE FREE USE OF THE
SCRIPTURES BY THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

Dr. Doyle, being questioned on this matter by the Lords, first says, that “ a rescript of Pius

norance and presumption are to be expected, as matters of course, in any discussion of the Edinburgh Review, in which religion is concerned. But when such an assertion, as I have cited above, is accompanied by such barefaced disregard to truth as is exhibited in what follows below, it is the duty of every honest man, in whose way these matters happen to fall, to hold forth to merited scorn the profligate and unprincipled character of a journal, which can have recourse to these miserable frauds:

“ It would be well were those Protestant divines, who have
“ been so forward in bringing accusations against the Catholics,
“ and in declaring what the doctrines of Roman Catholics are,
“ from their own views and inferences, *to let the Roman Catholic*
“ *Church speak for itself; and to allow its dogmas to be learned from*
“ *its councils, its professions of faith, its catechisms, its liturgies,*
“ *and its most able divines. For our own part, we feel it to be our*
“ *duty, in approaching the delicate, and now highly important*
“ *task, of endeavouring to develop the real principles of the*
“ *Roman Catholic Religion, with respect to the so much talked*
“ *of authority and influence of the Pope, to suspect all our own*
“ *old and long cherished opinions; to investigate each fact of the*
“ *case, as if for the first time presented to our understanding;*
“ *and, above all, not to take doctrines of the Catholics at second-*
“ *hand, but to refer directly to the known depositaries of their*

“ VI. exhorting the faithful to read the Word
 “ of God, is prefixed to their Editions, in Eng-

*“ faith and discipline.” “The Reverend petitioners of the Church
 “ of England would do well to reflect, that in vilifying and misre-
 “ presenting the Catholic religion, they are raising a prejudice
 “ against a religion that has a very great similarity to their own.”*
 Then, among other matter almost equally veracious, occurs what
 I first cited. “ The doctrines of the Catholic church, as to ab-
 “ solution, confession, and penance, are laid down in the Com-
 “ mon Prayer Book in the same words as they are described in
 “ the Catholic Books.”

All this, we see, is not mere ignorance. It is intimated with
 a ludicrous parade of research and self-complacency, that
 “ councils, professions of faith, catechisms, liturgies,” &c. have
 been consulted; whereas, it is perfectly certain, that if the
 writer had really had recourse to any tolerable authorities, be-
 fore he had the hardihood to impose such a statement on his
 readers, he would have found them expressing directly the con-
 trary to what he affirms.

Of the other blunders and misrepresentations, of which this
 article would present a plentiful crop to any one who thought
 them worth gathering, I have neither the time nor the patience
 to undertake the exposure. Happily, the day is past, when
 much mischief can ensue from this quarter. But there is one
 particular, on which I must dwell for a moment, I mean the
 miserable attempt to whisper away the character of the Rev. J.
 Blanco White, and his book, in the following note at p. 135.
 “ Mr. Charles Butler, in his Book of the Roman Catholic
 “ Church refers to the Canon of the Tenth Session of this
 “ Council, and says, that it defined that ‘ full power was
 “ ‘ delegated to the Bishop of Rome, in the person of St. Peter’
 “ ‘ to feed, regulate, and govern the Universal Church, *as ex-*

"lish, of the Bible," which *rescript certainly does not appear in* the only edition which I have been

" ' *pressed in the General Councils and holy canons.*' This, Mr. Butler declares, ' IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE, and beyond it no Roman Catholic is required to believe.' Mr. Blanco White, in his late publication, denies the accuracy of the declaration of Mr. Butler, and quotes the words, ' full power to feed, regulate, and govern the Universal Church,' as giving an unlimited power, without quoting the words immediately following, ' *as expressed in the general councils and holy canons:*' which words directly qualify and limit the power!!! Mr. Blanco White, we regret to say, *betrays many similar suppressions of the whole truth in his book.*"

Now will it be believed, that this shameless attack on an able, learned, and exiled foreigner, one who has the strongest of all claims on the respect of every friend of literature and virtue, who has made large sacrifices of wealth and honours at the dictate of conscience, whose only fault, even in the eyes of this reviewer, must be, that he has embraced, from honest conviction, the faith and the communion of the Church of England,—rests altogether on the false rendering of a few plain Latin words in the decree of the Council of Florence, which any fourth-form boy at the High-school at Edinburgh could have taught the Reviewer and Mr. Butler how to construe?

Those words are as follows:—" *Quemadmodum et in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris Canonibus continetur.*" (As also is contained in the Acts of the General Councils and holy Canons.) This is rendered by these precious scholars, "as expressed in the General Councils, and Holy Canons," and the Reviewer adds, "*which words directly qualify and limit the power.*" But let me ask this learned clerk, who

able to consult, *the Stereotype edition of last year.** Henext enumerates no fewer than SEVEN editions of the Bible, which they have procured to be published in Ireland, since the invention of the art of printing, for a population which is

tells us he has "felt it his duty" to examine Councils, &c., can he name any one admitted General Council, which does "qualify and limit the power of the Pope?" "Yes," says he, p. 134. "the Councils of Constance and Basil, *among the most authoritative* that ever assembled, have declared in express terms, that the supreme power of the Church-militant under Christ, over all the faithful, and even over the Pope himself, "with respect to matters of faith, is vested in General Councils," and yet, three pages before, note, p. 131. he has himself said, that "*the decrees of a General Council, to be valid, must be approved by the Pope!*" But can he be so very ignorant, as not to know, that the Councils of Constance and Basil, which he styles "*among the most authoritative that ever assembled,*" have, in truth, no authority at all, on the particulars in which they are alleged by him? and this, even on the principle admitted by himself, the want of the sanction of the Pope? Accordingly, the former is not admitted into Bellarmine's list of approved General Councils, and though it appears in Delahogue's list, it is with an intimation, that its earlier Sessions, in which the Decree quoted by the Reviewer was passed, have not the consent of the Church at large. As for the Council of Basil, it is not admitted even into Delahogue's list, much less into that of Bellarmine.—*See Delahogue de Eccl. App. ii. p. 439.*

* It seems from Mr. Donellan's evidence before the Lords, p. 379, that this rescript was prefixed to *only one* edition; and it is there stated, that the rescript recommended the reading of the Scriptures, "*under proper restrictions and regulations.*"

stated, with whatever accuracy, to amount at the present day to not less than six millions! and then proceeds as follows :—“ So that of all “ the things said of us, there is not any thing “ more opposed to truth, than that we are averse “ to the circulation of the Word of God.”—p. 237.

My observations on this point will not give me much labour of argument ; I shall, in truth, have little more to do than to use my scissors.

I will first present my readers with an extract from the “ Fourth Rule De Libris prohibitis,” set forth by the select Fathers to whom the Synod of Trent had committed this charge, and “ approved and confirmed by Pius IV. ;” reminding my readers, that the decrees of this council, even respecting discipline, have been accepted, and are, of course, valid, in almost every part of Ireland.

“ Since it is manifest by experience, that if “ the holy Bibles in the vulgar language are per- “ mitted to be read every where without discri- “ mination, more harm than good arises, let the “ judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided “ by in this particular. So that after consult- “ ing with the parish minister or the confessor, “ they may grant permission to read transla- “ tions of the Scriptures made by Catholic Au- “ thors, to those whom they shall have under- “ stood to be able to receive no harm, but an

“ increase of faith and piety from such reading ;
“ which faculty let them have in writing. But
“ whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles,
“ or have them in possession without such fa-
“ culty, shall not be capable of receiving abso-
“ lution of their sins, unless they have first given
“ up their Bibles to the ordinary. Booksellers
“ who shall sell, or in any other way furnish,
“ Bibles in the vulgar tongue to any one not
“ possessed of the license aforesaid, shall for-
“ feit the price of the books, which is to be ap-
“ plied by the bishop to pious uses, and shall
“ be otherwise punished at the pleasure of the
“ same bishop according to the degree of the
“ offence. Moreover, regulars (i. e. monks) may
“ not read or purchase the same without license
“ had from their principals.”

My next extract shall be from the Encyclical Letter of the present Pope, Leo XII., dated 3d May, 1824, and published with “ Pastoral In-
“ structions to all the faithful,” by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland.

“ We also, venerable brethren, in conformity
“ with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn
“ away your flock, by all means, from *these*
“ *poisonous pastures*,” (the Scriptures translated
into the vulgar tongue.) “ Reprove, beseech,
“ be instant in season and out of season, in all
“ patience and doctrine, that the faithful entrusted

“ to you (adhering strictly to the rules of our
 “ Congregation of the Index),* be persuaded,
 “ that *if the Sacred Scriptures be every indiscrimi-*
 “ *nately published*, more evil than advantage
 “ will arise thence, on account of the rashness
 “ of men.”—p. 16.

To this passage the Irish prelates, Dr. Doyle among the rest, in their “ Pastoral Instructions,” refer in the following terms; “ Our Holy Father
 “ recommends to the observance of the faith-
 “ ful, a rule of the Congregation of the Index,
 “ which prohibits the perusal of the Sacred
 “ Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without the
 “ sanction of the competent authorities. His
 “ Holiness wisely remarks, ‘ that more evil than
 “ ‘ good is found to result from the indiscrimi-
 “ ‘ nate perusal of them, &c.’ *In this sentiment*
 “ *of our head and chief we fully concur.*”—p. 54.

The recent Synod of Dublin, p. 12, says, as follows :—“ The Catholics in Ireland, *of mature*
 “ *years*, are *permitted* to read authentic and ap-

* This rule has just been cited above. It is worth remarking, by the way, that that honest controvertist and faithful historian, Dr. Lingard, has spoken of the Index as follows :—“ The
 “ authority of the Index was always very confined, and in many
 “ Catholic countries was never acknowledged. Yet this very
 “ prohibition contained in the Index is only conditional, and
 “ *has always been considered as a temporary regulation.*”—Lingard’s Tracts, p. 232.

“ proved translations of the Holy Scriptures,
 “ with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to
 “ use them in the spirit of piety, humility and
 “ obedience.”

My last extracts on this subject shall be from the writings of Dr. Doyle himself. “ The Scriptures
 “ alone have never saved any one, they are inca-
 “ pable of giving salvation, it is not their object;
 “ it is not the end for which they were written.
 “ They hold a dignified place amongst the
 “ means of the institution, which Christ formed
 “ for the purpose of saving his elect; but *though*
 “ *they never had been written, this end would have*
 “ *been attained,* and all who were pre-ordained to
 “ eternal life would have been gathered to the
 “ Church, and fed with the bread of life.”—
 I. K. L. p. 164.

Let us pause one moment here. “ Receive
 “ with meekness the engrafted word, which is
 “ *able to save your souls,*” says St. Paul.—It is
 able to do no such thing, says Dr. Doyle, “ *the*
 “ *Scriptures alone have never saved any one,*”
 —where by the word “alone” he does not
 mean, without the assistance of the grace of
 God, but without the assistance of the priest.

“ From a child,” says the same St. Paul to
 Timothy, “ thou hast known the Holy Scrip-
 “ tures which are *able to make thee wise unto sal-*
 “ *vation.*” What says Dr. Doyle? “ *They are*

“incapable of giving salvation, it is not their object, it is not their end.”

Once more. “These are written,” says St. John, “that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.” “This is all very well,” says Dr. Doyle; “but do not think the Scriptures necessary; *though they never had been written, this would have been attained, and we should have had life without them.*”

Let me proceed with my extracts. “Had the chain, with which Henry the Eighth tied the Bible to the preaching desk in England, never been broken, that country would not have witnessed the scenes which her history records,” (very true!) and *“she might this day be the most free and happy nation on the earth, reposing in the bosom of the Catholic church!”*

“Wherever the reading of the Bible is not regulated by a salutary discipline such as our’s, it leads a great portion of the people necessarily to fanaticism or to infidelity.”—p. 179.

“The entire Scriptures, or portions of them, may be read for edification and instruction by all who will not abuse them, or who, in the opinion of those, whom the Holy Ghost placed to rule the church, are like to profit by them.”—p. 207.

“ What then is the difference between us?—
 “ a very wide one indeed ; for we maintain that
 “ the Scripture is given to all, that they may,
 “ each in his proper station, be instructed by it
 “ unto righteousness. *Not all of it to be entrusted*
 “ *to each, but what is useful to every one, that no*
 “ *one may be more wise than he ought, but that*
 “ he may be wise to sobriety. This is the eco-
 “ nomy of our church.”*—p. 217.

After this detail of Dr. Doyle’s sentiments respecting the Scriptures, it is a matter of course, that he should be vehemently opposed to the

* To enliven his grave statement of this church’s economy, he is pleased to favour his readers with the following most edifying and instructive narrative in testimony of his respect for the word of God, when it is at all associated with the acts of heretics. “ I heard of a poor man in the county of Kildare, “ who, if I gave him a Bible, would venerate it more than any “-thing he possessed, but having been favoured by the lady of “ his master with one of the Societies’ Bibles without note or “ comment, accepted of it with all the reverence which the “ fear of losing his situation inspired. But, behold ! when the “ night closed, and all danger of detection was removed, he, “ lest he should be infected with heresy exhaled from the Pro- “ testant Bible during his sleep, *took it with a tongs, for he “ would not defile his touch with it, and buried it in a grave which “ he had prepared for it in his garden ! I do admire the orthodoxy “ of this Kildare peasant ; nay, I admire it greatly ; and should “ I happen to meet him, I shall reward him for his zeal.”—*
 p. 179.

It is but justice to the church, in which Dr. Doyle is a bishop,

efforts of the Bible Society. I am not going to obtrude any remarks in favour of that Society, whose advocates need no support in arguing with their Irish opponents; but it is interesting to observe Dr. Doyle's extreme sensibility to every thing like persecution. It exhibits itself in the following very singular declaration; from which it is quite plain, that when the legislature shall have gratified him and his friends with the repeal of every adverse statute, he will not be satisfied, unless the Bible Society be also put down by act of parliament. " We have borne
 " many things, but *we have never borne a perse-*
 " *cution more bitter than what now assails us.*
 " As the persecution of the church by Julian in
 " the time of peace was more afflicting than that
 " of Nero or Domitian, so *what we suffer from these*
 " *societies, the power and prejudice they have em-*
 " *bodied against us, is more tormenting than what*
 " *we endured under Anne or the Second George.*" (p. 153.) With that consistency, which is the inseparable characteristic of truth, he tells us presently afterwards, as part of his "general

to add, that that church is not answerable for this foul insult on the feelings of every Christian. The order of the church, as recognized by himself, (Evidence before the Lords, p. 238.) is this, that while all other tracts communicated by Protestants are to be restored to their owners or destroyed; *Bibles and Testaments are to be brought to the parish priest.*

“ conclusion from the foregoing observations,” that “ the *Society's labours hitherto have been*, and “ must continue, *fruitless*, whether in converting “ infidels, or *in disturbing Catholicity.*”

From these various Extracts my reader will form his own judgment of the injustice done to the Roman Catholic Church, when it is said to be “ averse to the circulation of the Word of “ God.”

POWER OF THE POPE.

We have here a subject, which is rendered more interesting than any that has preceded it, by the political question with which it is so intimately connected. I am, afraid, therefore, that it will occupy us, in its several ramifications, a little longer than I would wish.

Dr. Doyle's evidence will be mainly, though not exclusively, my text book; and very curious, indeed, are the texts recorded therein.

I will begin with one or two of the most marvellous.

“ As far as I am acquainted with the history of such claims,” (the claims of the Popes to interfere with the temporal rights of Princes,) “ they rested them upon such temporal rights “ previously acquired by themselves or their “ predecessors”—(“ by Kings and Princes making their states tributary to the Holy See, or

“resigning them into the hands of the Pope, and then accepting them back again, as Gifts of the Holy See,”) “with the single exception of, I think, Boniface the Eighth. He in a contest, as I recollect, with some king of France, includes in a brief, which he issued, a declaration that he did so by an authority vested in him from above. This is the only instance of the kind, which has occurred to me in my reading.”*

I must frankly express my astonishment, that the reading of this distinguished divine has been so very much confined. Among innumerable instances with which my own narrow reading has furnished me (some of which have been mentioned in p. 279, 281 of my Letters to you), I will select the following as more peculiarly interesting to the people of this country: it is the commencement of Paul III.'s bull “Ejus qui,”† condemning, excommunicating, and hurling from his throne, our own sovereign, Henry VIII.; and it presents us with his Holiness's own statement of the authority upon which he rested that very vigorous measure. “We, representing on earth Him, who ordereth all things by his wonderful Providence, and placed in the seat of Judgment, according to the prediction of the prophet Jeremiah (i. 10.)

* Commons, 191. † Bull. Mag. t. i. p. 707.

“ ‘ See! I have set thee up over the nations and
 “ ‘ over the kingdoms, to root up and to pull
 “ ‘ down, and to destroy and to throw down; to
 “ ‘ build and to plant, &c.’ ” Thus it appears
 that this is the standing text on these occasions,
 it is not only adopted by Boniface VIII. and In-
 nocent III. but also by Paul III. Pius V. &c. &c.

There is, however, one instance, which is in-
 star omnium against Dr. Doyle’s pleasant theory
 to account for the claims of the Pope to temporal
 power in independent states ; I mean the gift of
 America to Spain, and of India to Portugal, by
 Alexander VI.* Surely these countries had
 never been surrendered in any way to him or
 his predecessors.

But let us look at another assertion of Dr.
 Doyle :

“ The Pope,” says he, “ at present does
 “ not interfere, or attempt to interfere, with the
 “ temporal concerns of any kingdom in Europe ;
 “ to this, perhaps, there is an exception with
 “ regard to the kingdom of Naples.” “ Let me
 “ repeat, that the case of Naples is the only one
 “ in which the Popes of Rome have, for the
 “ last three centuries nearly, interfered in any
 “ way directly, or indirectly, with the temporal
 “ concerns of any state in Europe.”—Com. 191.

Such is his language before the Commons.

* See “ Herrera,” in Robertson’s *America*, vol. i. p. 127.

On a subsequent day in his second examination by the Lords* (contrary to his usual practice before that auditory) he ventures on a higher flight, and actually brings himself to make *on oath* the following portentous asseveration.—

“The Church has *uniformly for nine centuries*,
“by her *Popes* themselves, by her practice, and
“by her doctrines, and by her academies,
“*maintained that the Popes have no right whatever*
“*to interfere with the temporal sovereignties or*
“*rights of kings or princes.*”

There are some positions, which it is difficult to refute, without appearing to depart from the respect which an author ought always to feel for the understanding and information of his readers: and if there ever was an instance of this kind, the present may pre-eminently claim to be so regarded—Let me then seriously assure my readers, that I do not suppose there is a man among them so ignorant as to believe what Dr. Doyle has here been pleased to say; and that in undertaking to adduce a few of the many facts which are at variance with his sworn assertion, I have no other object in view than to place his credit as a witness in its proper light.

In doing this I will make no advantage of the enlarged term of nine centuries past taken by him, but will suppose, for a while, that such

* Lords, p. 311.

personages as Innocent III. Gregory VII. and Dr. Doyle's old friend Boniface VIII. cum multis aliis, are utterly unknown to history. In short, I will limit my inquiries to the Doctor's more modest statement before the Commons, that "*in no case except that of Naples have the Popes, for the last three centuries nearly, interfered in any way, directly or indirectly, with the temporal concerns of any state in Europe.*"

In the year 1536, Paul III. put forth the famous Bull "*Consueverunt,*"* commonly called in *cœna Domini*, because it was published on Maundy Thursday, and was to be publicly proclaimed at Rome on every subsequent anniversary of that day. It was in fact regularly so proclaimed in every church at Rome, almost within our own memory.

In this Bull renewed and enlarged by subsequent Popes, and especially by Paul V. in his Bull "*Pastoralis officii;*"† "*All heretics (in particular Lutherans, Calvinists, &c.) are excommunicated and anathematized*"—so are "*all who appeal from the orders or decrees of the Pope to a General Council; all who publish any statutes, decrees, &c. whereby the ecclesiastical liberty is violated, or in any way oppressed, or the rights of the Holy See and of*

* Bullar. Mag. t. i. p. 718. † Id. t. iii. p. 282.

“ any other church directly or indirectly preju-
 “ diced—All who hinder Archbishops and Bi-
 “ shops from exerting their jurisdiction against
 “ any persons whatsoever, according as the Ca-
 “ nons and the sacred Ecclesiastical Constitu-
 “ tions, and the decrees of General Councils,
 “ *especially that of Trent*, lay down—All who
 “ usurp any jurisdictions, fruits, revenues,
 “ and emoluments belonging to the Holy See,
 “ and any ecclesiastical persons, by reason of
 “ churches, monasteries, or other ecclesiastical
 “ benefices ; or who upon any occasion or
 “ causes sequester the said revenues without the
 “ express leave of the Pope.”—“ Also on all
 “ who, without consent of the Pope, lay any
 “ tenths, subsidies, or other burthens on pre-
 “ lates and ecclesiastical persons on account of
 “ their churches, monasteries, or other ecclesi-
 “ astical goods, or who directly or indirectly
 “ assist, execute, or procure the said things,
 “ or give aid, counsel, or favour to them who
 “ do; of whatever dignity, condition, or quality
 “ they be, though emperor, king, &c.—All who
 “ presume to invade, &c. the city of Rome.—
 “ No one to be absolved from the foresaid cen-
 “ sures by any other than the Pope himself, ex-
 “ cept he be at the point of death.”

In 1558, the ambassador of our own illustrious

Queen Elizabeth was told by Paul IV. that she was a bastard, and that England was only a fief of the Holy See ; that the pretended Queen must begin by suspending the exercise of her function, till the Court of Rome had pronounced its sovereign judgment. A Bull of the same Pope, “*Cum ex Apostolatu*,”* declares that all princes, kings, and the emperor, falling into heresy, forfeit thereby their principalities and empire aforesaid. And this was confirmed by Pius V. in his Bull “*Inter multiplices*.”†

Pius V. in his Bull “*Regnans in Excelsis*,”‡ A.D. 1570, excommunicated Elizabeth, and deprived her of her kingdom. This sentence was renewed by Sixtus V. who published a solemn Bull, in which he styles Elizabeth an usurper, a heretic, and an excommunicate—gives her throne to Philip II. and commands the English to join the Spaniards in dethroning her.§

The same Pope proceeded in the same way against Henry of Navarre (afterwards Henry IV.) the Prince of Condé, and all their adherents, pronouncing them heretics, &c. and declaring their estates and dominions forfeited—absolving their subjects from allegiance, and charging them not

* Bullar. Mag. t. i. p. 840.

† Ibid. t. ii. p. 214.

‡ Ibid. t. ii. p. 324.

§ Thuani Hist. l. 89. c. 9.

to pay them obedience under pain of the greater excommunication.*

In 1606, Paul V. forbade the Roman Catholics of this kingdom to take the oath of allegiance prescribed by James I. (which oath denied the power of the Pope to destroy the King, and to absolve his subjects from their allegiance; and further declared damnable and heretical the position that Princes excommunicated may be deprived or murdered, and that the Pope hath no power to absolve from the same). "Such an oath," says Paul, "cannot be taken without hurting of the Catholic faith, and the salvation of your souls; seeing it contains many things, which are flat contrary to faith and salvation." This prohibition was repeated in the following year.†

Urban VIII. refused to Louis XIII. and Louis XIV. the title of King of Navarre, solely on the ground of the excommunication and deposition by Julius II. of John d'Albret, whose heirs those sovereigns were.‡

But the most extraordinary and most instructive instance of the exercise of Papal power in

* Thuani Hist. l. lxxxii. c. 5.

† See King James's Works, p. 251.

‡ Essai Historique sur la Puissance temporelle des Papes, tom. i. p. 343.

the seventeenth century was exhibited by Innocent X. who in a Bull (*Zelo domus Dei**) protested against, and declared void, the Treaties of Munster and Osnaburgh, on the express ground “of leaving ecclesiastical pro-
 “ perty in the hands of heretics, of *permit-*
 “ *ting the free exercise of their heresy* to those
 “ of the Confession of Augsburg, of allowing
 “ those heretics to be advanced to civil dignities
 “ and offices.” It proceeds to state, that Innocent’s nuncio “had protested against these
 “ articles, but without effect, *on the well known*
 “ *principle of law, that no treaty on ecclesiastical*
 “ *matters, made without the authority of the Pope,*
 “ *is binding*; and therefore he now, in the most
 “ solemn manner, abrogates these articles, as
 “ utterly invalid, unjust, &c. &c. *and declares*
 “ *that no one, by whatever oath they may have been*
 “ *sanctioned, is bound to the observance of them.*”

In the year 1682, the celebrated Declaration of the liberties of the Gallican Church was made. This Declaration, of which, among other authorities, the Edinburgh Review has recently said (No. 85, p. 136.) “that after
 “ being confirmed by an Edict of the King, it
 “ was registered by the Parliament, and *has*
 “ *ever since been uniformly considered as the*

* Bullar. Mag. tom. iv. p. 466.

“*recognized and fundamental law of the state,*” was condemned by Innocent XI. who refused the Bulls of Institution to some divines named by Louis XIV. to certain vacant bishoprics, on the ground of their having assisted in this assembly, and consequently *erred in faith.** These articles were also condemned by Alexander VIII.; and Innocent XII. not only refused to grant the Bulls to the Bishops, but obtained from them, *on the demand of Louis XIV. himself,* a letter, in which, after expressing their deep penitence for having joined in the Assembly of 1682, they proceed to say, that “whatever might be deemed to have been decreed in that Assembly concerning ecclesiastical power and episcopal authority, they consider as not decreed, and declare that it ought to be so considered.”† Nay, even this was not all, Louis himself, in a letter to the Pope, makes the following distinct assurance, “I have pleasure in giving your Holiness to know, that I have issued the necessary orders that the things contained in *my Edict* of the 2d of May, 1682, touching the declaration

* *Essai Historique*, tom. i. p. 360.

† *Quicquid in iisdem comitiis circa ecclesiasticam potestatem et pontificiam auctoritatem decretum censeri potuit, pro non decreto habeo et habendum esse declaro.*—tom. ii. p. 197.

“ made by the clergy of France (to which I
 “ was compelled by conjunctures now passed)
 “ *should not be obeyed*, being desirous that not
 “ only your Holiness should be informed of my
 “ sentiments, but also that the whole world
 “ should perceive, by a particular mark, the
 “ veneration which I have for your great and
 “ holy qualities.”*

Of the condemnation passed on the Declaration of French bishops, in 1682, by Innocent XI. and Alexander VIII. it is proper to add, that it was cited with strong approbation by Pius VI. in his Bull, “*Auctorem Fidei*,” A. .D 1794,† and that all the power of Buonaparte could not prevail on Pius VII. when a prisoner at Savona, in 1811, to acknowledge the doctrines affirmed in that Declaration.‡

In 1712, as is stated by the Archbishop of Dublin, in his evidence before the Lords,§ Clement XI. addressed a letter to the Emperor Charles VI. on some of the provisions of the Treaty of Alt-Ranstadt, by which certain places were to be surrendered to “an execrable sect.”

* *Essai Historique*, t. ii. p. 195.

† *Ibid.* &c. t. ii. p. 223.

‡ *Fragmens relatifs à l'Histoire Ecclesiastique*. Paris, 1814. p. 269.

§ Lords, 748.

In it he thus addresses the Emperor; “ We
 “ by these presents denounce to your Majesty,
 “ and at the same time, by the authority com-
 “ mitted to us by the Omnipotent God, declare
 “ the said covenants, and every thing contained
 “ therein, which are in any wise obstructive of,
 “ or hurtful to, or which may be said, esteemed,
 “ pretended, or understood, to occasion, or to
 “ bring, or to have brought, the least prejudice,
 “ &c. to the Catholic Faith, divine worship,
 “ salvation of souls, the authority, jurisdiction,
 “ or any rights of the Church whatsoever, to
 “ be, and to have been, and perpetually to
 “ remain hereafter, null, unjust, reprobated,
 “ void, and evacuated of all force from the
 “ beginning, and that *no person is bound to the*
 “ *observance of them, although the same have been*
 “ *repeated, ratified, or secured by oath.*”

In 1768, Clement XIII. published a brief on occasion of certain edicts issued by the Duke of Parma and Placentia in his own states, (states which belonged to him in full sovereignty by the right of succession, by that of conquest, and by the most solemn treaties, coalesced in the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.) In that brief, Clement, in the plenitude of his authority, abrogated, repealed, and annulled, as being prejudicial to the liberty, immunity, and juris-

diction of the Church, whatever the Prince of Parma had ordered in his edicts, and forbade his subjects to obey their sovereign. This Papal mandate further declares, "that all who
 " have published the edicts, or done any act in
 " consequence of them, those that recognize
 " the illegal power of the magistrates, &c. over
 " ecclesiastics and church property, and, in
 " general, all that have been parties thereto,
 " have incurred the ecclesiastical censures
 " denounced by the Holy Canons, by the De-
 " crees of the General Councils, by the Apos-
 " tolic Ordinances, and especially by the Bull
 " read on Holy Thursday (In Cœna Domini),
 " that they are deprived of all their privileges,
 " and incapacitated from receiving absolution,
 " until they shall have fully and entirely
 " restored matters to their former condition, or
 " shall have made suitable satisfaction to the
 " Church, and to the Holy See."*

In order to appreciate the full value of this instance, we must bear in mind that the Duke of Parma was himself a member of the House of Bourbon, and that its other royal branches considered this exertion of Papal vigour, as an experiment to ascertain how far similar preten-

* Rep. of Com. H. of C. 1816, "on Regulation of Roman Catholics in Foreign States." p. 269.

sions would be tolerated in the more powerful states of Europe.

Of the Bull *In Cœna Domini*, Cardinal Erskine, the "Most Holy Auditor of his Holiness," "Pro-
"motore della Fide," in a note to Sir J. C. Hippesley, dated August, 1793, immediately before he was dispatched by the Pope on his mission to England, thus writes. Its publication on Holy Thursday was "discontinued by
"Clement XIII. (q. XIV.) out of a compli-
"ment to some princes, to whom parts of it
"were obnoxious." "*This Bull*, although the
"formality of its publication is now omitted,
"is nevertheless implicitly in full vigour in all its
"extension, and is likewise observed in all cases
"where there is no impediment to the exertion of
"the Pope's authority: therefore it must be legally
"looked upon as a public declaration to preserve
"his rights."*

Accordingly, and in compliance with the tenor of this Bull, *In Cœna Domini*, so late as in June, 1809, Pius VII. issued a Bull,† excommunicating and anathematising Buonaparte and all who adhered to him in his Invasion of the Papal States. And, lest it should be objected

* Ibid. p. 341.

† "Correspondance authentique de la Cour de Rome avec
"la France," &c. Paris, 1814.

that this sentence was directed against the violations of the spiritual rights of the Pope, it is expressly stated; that "all who have acted against even the temporal rights of the Church and of the Holy See, all who have given orders to that effect, all their favourers, counsellors, and adherents, all, in short, who have facilitated the execution of those orders, or have executed them themselves, have incurred the greater excommunication, and other censures and ecclesiastical penalties, imposed by the Holy Canons, &c. by the decrees of General Councils; and particularly by that of the Council of Trent."

I should not do justice to the vigour of this proceeding, if I omitted to cite particularly the following sentence—"Let our persecutors, then, learn once for all, that the law of Jesus Christ has subjected them to our authority and to our throne. For *we also bear the sceptre*, and we can say that our power is far superior to their's, unless it be wished that the Spirit should yield to the flesh, that the interests of Heaven should give place to those of the earth. Already have so many Sovereign Pontiffs been forced to proceed to similar extremities against rebellious princes and kings, &c. and shall we be afraid to follow their example?"

"This very intelligible allusion to Gregory,

Innocent, &c. is followed afterwards by the following gracious language of forbearance: "But in the necessity in which we are placed of using the sword of severity which the Church has handed down to us, we cannot forget that *we hold on earth, unworthy as we are, the place of Him, who in executing justice ceases not to be the God of mercy.*" Therefore he forbids any damage being done "to the goods, the rights or prerogatives of those who are the subjects of these censures." But if it is *mercy* which makes him thus forbear, it is plain that *justice* would authorize him to strike.*

* The whole conduct of Rome towards Buonaparté is worthy of close attention, and proves that the ancient maxims of the Vatican still continue to form its standing policy. We have seen above the reasons which induced Pius, in 1809, to fulminate the censures of the Church. But it can be hardly necessary to remind my readers that when Buonaparte was in Egypt he had acknowledged Mahomet as the prophet of God; had spoken of the Koran as the object of his respect and love; and had even announced in one of his proclamations, that "it was predicted of him from the beginning of the world, that *he should put down the Cross.*"—(Proclamation du 1^{er} Nivôse an 7. et Moniteur du 30 Germinal an 7.) Yet all this while the thunders of the Vatican were not heard. On the contrary, with this apostate, this renegade, this mussulman, Pius VII. in due time, when it suited his interests, scrupled not to enter into a Concordat, to transfer to him from Louis XVIII. the fidelity of the French nation. This was not effected without a most edifying exhibition of Papal duplicity.

"Pius VII. was elected at Venice, in March, 1800, at a time when the affairs of the French were at a very low ebb. From Venice he wrote to Louis XVIII. as well as to all the other Roman-Catholic princes, acquainting him with his exaltation to the Popedom. But on his voyage from Venice to Ancona in his way to Rome, he was informed of the battle of Marengo, which had made Buonaparte master of Italy. He at first apprehended the re-establishment of the Roman

But it is time to have done with this point ; let me only add the following recent proof of the continuance not only of the pretensions of the Popes to interfere with the temporal interests of mankind, but also of their readiness to assert those pretensions, whenever an opportunity is given to them.

In February, 1803, the Diet of Ratisbon overturned the political and religious state of certain of the German churches and chapters, secularized their possessions and distributed some of them as indemnities to secular Protes-

“ Republic; but being set at ease on this head, and being
 “ assured by Buonaparte, through the Cardinal Martiniana,
 “ that he meant to re-establish the Roman-Catholic worship in
 “ France, and having received an invitation to send agents to
 “ enter into a negociation for that purpose, he thought it was
 “ ‘ for the interest of religion’ to recognize the new Governor
 “ in France, and ordered the Members of the Sacred College
 “ to write letters of compliment to its head. Therefore, when
 “ Cardinal Maury came to Rome, as ambassador from Louis,
 “ to present his letters of credence, Pius refused to receive them,
 “ by reason of the negociation he had resolved to open with
 “ the First Consul.

“ The commencement of his Pontificate will be for ever
 “ celebrated in history by that famous Concordat, in which he
 “ pronounced, of his own authority, the destitution of all the
 “ bishops and the extinction of all the episcopal titles in France
 “ —an unheard of operation, effected without any canonical
 “ forms, and in contempt of the most imprescriptible rights of
 “ the Gallican Church. If the precipitation and the imperious
 “ tone in which this was accomplished bears on it the marks
 “ of the despot who was pressing him—still one may see that
 “ he himself was not sorry to burst asunder at one stroke the
 “ barriers which separate the Gallican Liberties from the ultra-
 “ montane doctrines.—The anti-concordist bishops rested on
 “ the Gallican Liberties; the Concordists had no other colour
 “ for their titles but the ultra-montane maxims.”—(V. Du Pape
 et Des Jésuites.)

tant princes. This was the subject of many dispatches from Rome in 1803, 4, 5: in particular of an instruction to the Nuncio resident at Vienna, in the following terms:—

“ Not only has the Church taken care to
 “ prevent heretics from occupying ecclesiastical
 “ property, it has moreover established, as the
 “ penalty of the crime of heresy, the confisca-
 “ tion and loss of all the goods possessed by
 “ heretics. This punishment is decreed, with
 “ respect to the goods of individuals, in the
 “ decretal of Innocent III. cap. Vergentes X.
 “ de Hæret. and with respect to principalities
 “ and fiefs *it is a rule of the Canon law, cap.*
 “ *Absolutos XVI. de Hæreticis, that subjects*
 “ *of a prince manifestly heretical remain ab-*
 “ *solved from all homage whatever, from fealty*
 “ *and obedience to the same; and no one,*
 “ however little versed in history, can be
 “ ignorant of the sentences of deposition pro-
 “ nounced by Popes and Councils against
 “ Princes who are obstinate in heresy. We
 “ have fallen on times so calamitous, and so
 “ full of humiliation to the spouse of Jesus
 “ Christ, that as it is not possible to her to
 “ exert, so neither is it expedient to remember,
 “ these its most holy maxims of just rigour
 “ against the enemies and rebels to the faith.
 “ But though *her right of deposing heretics from*
 “ *their principalities, and of declaring them to*

“ have forfeited their possessions, cannot be
 “ exercised, could she ever positively permit,
 “ that in order to make up new principalities,
 “ and new possessions, for them, she should
 “ herself be despoiled? What an occasion of
 “ ridicule would not the Church give to those
 “ very heretics and infidels! who, insulting her
 “ grief, would say that means had been found
 “ at last to make her *tolerant*.”*

I leave these matters, without comment, to the admirers of Dr. Doyle, and should be happy to hear from any one among them, whether it is any longer quite impossible to doubt either the honesty or the accuracy of that prelate, when he tells the Commons, and swears to the Lords, that the Popes have for nine, or for three centuries, renounced all claim to interfere with the temporal rights of princes.

But we shall be told that, whether Dr. Doyle is right or wrong in his statement, at least it is quite certain that the pretensions of the Popes, if they should interfere in civil matters, would now only be laughed at; that we have the solemn assurances, nay oaths, of the Irish Prelates that they would spurn any mandates

* Essai Historique, t. ii. p. 320.

from Rome which were inconsistent with their allegiance to their lawful sovereign.

All this, for aught I know, may be very readily believed ; for, to say the truth, there is pretty strong proof that, even in Ireland, the Pope, acting of his own mere motion, *proprio suo motu*, as he is wont to say, would be one of the most harmless of all the innumerable performers on that busy stage. I have no doubt that the bishops would manage very effectually to keep him from exercising any power to *his own* aggrandisement. They have testified quite sufficiently their independence on the Court of Rome : and the Bulls and Briefs of the Vatican, issuing in defiance of their authority, would be the most innocuous instruments imaginable. This is apparent from the contempt with which they scrupled not to treat the Jubilee of last year, and still more from their undisguised resistance to the Papal Rescript, which issued some years ago, in favour of the promised Veto.

But does it, therefore, follow, that the ancient and never disclaimed pretensions of the Papacy to a right of at least indirect interference in temporal matters, are absolutely nugatory ? that a prudent government may treat them with as

much contempt, as they would the ravings of fifth-monarchy men, or the dreams of Muggletonians? Far from it—the Pope, though a most powerless principal, would be a most effective ally—and, as such, under the skilful direction of an Irish hierarchy, not distinguished, like Dr. Doyle, for meekness, loyalty, and every peaceful virtue which becomes a Christian Bishop, he might be enabled to bring into prompt and vigorous action many of those slumbering energies, the occasional display of which excites at present only a passing feeling of wonder or contempt.

The truth is, that the very peculiar condition of Ireland renders this a matter of much greater likelihood, and even facility, there, than it could be in any other country in Christendom. Where the Sovereign is himself a professed member of the Church of Rome, he can, in modern days, have little to apprehend from any pretensions of the Pope. For, besides that the policy of the Vatican is commonly disposed, in such a case, to accept, with apparent contentment, just so much of deference and respect, as the prince may be induced to give, the people themselves, satisfied with the outward demonstrations of their prince's orthodoxy, and general obedience to the Holy See in *spirituals*, are easily

quieted in respect to any degree of hostility to which their sovereign may proceed in temporal matters. Thus it was, that the most bigotted nation in Europe could hear, with composure, that the armies of their "most Catholic" monarch had sacked Rome, and consigned the Holy Father himself to a dungeon:—thus too "the "most Christian" King, "the eldest Son of the "Church," has been able to set at nought the dearest claims of the Vatican, and to establish for his national Church a scheme of liberties, which Rome, when it dares, scruples not to treat as downright heresies.

Again, in countries where the sovereign is at once Protestant and absolute, the flexible nature of papal policy readily accommodates itself to the necessities of the case—accepts all it can get with the best grace possible—consents, for instance, as in Russia and Silesia, that the monarch shall absolutely nominate every bishop, but takes care to save appearances by *nominating the same persons*, and investing them with the insignia of their office, as of its own free choice!

In England, where (thank God!) the sovereign is Protestant and not absolute, and where the spirit of the constitution and the universal feelings of the nation, forbid such direct interference with the religious ordinances of a dissenting

Church—not only does the immense preponderance of a Protestant population, but also (I admit the gratifying truth with heartfelt pleasure) the tried loyalty, the genuine British spirit, of our Roman-Catholic countrymen themselves, afford a powerful security against all the worst exorbitances of either papal or priestly ambition.

But in Ireland, where it would, unhappily, be idle mockery to talk of the tried loyalty and genuine British spirit of the great mass of its Roman-Catholic inhabitants, there exists almost every motive, and every facility, which can tempt an ambitious hierarchy to abuse the means which their religion so abundantly supplies for the aggrandisement of their order, and the exaltation of their Church. Among these means, the old pretensions of the Pope, kept in due subservience to the interests of the Bishops, would be not the least effectual.

This is not mere theory. Its truth is written in characters of blood in the history of Ireland itself: and be it always remembered, that while the lights and intelligence of other nations have been incalculably progressive, the Irish (the Roman-Catholic Irish multitude, I mean) continue nearly what they were in the middle of the seventeenth century, in the days of Ormond

and Rinuccini. That multitude could again be stimulated by an ambitious priesthood to defeat the honest efforts of the nobles and the gentry of the land, whose wishes and whose views must always ultimately be for peace—and to replunge their country in all the horrors of civil war.

Hence it is, that some effectual security for the loyalty and peaceable demeanour of the clergy, particularly of the Bishops, ought to be deemed an indispensable part of any plan for the permanent pacification of Ireland. Surely, such an observation cannot be deemed ill-timed, when the most popular and powerful prelate among them, who has admitted in his sworn testimony before parliament,* that “Insurrection is one of the offences, for which a bishop might with great propriety excommunicate;” for “any revolt against the state is one of the “most grave of offences”—has yet not scrupled to declare in a public Letter† to a member of the House of Commons, that “the Minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the “Catholic priesthood” in the tremendous conflict which he denounces as at hand; “they “have been ill-treated, and they may yield for

* Lords, p. 506.

† Letter of Dr. Doyle to A. Robertson, Esq. M. P. p. 4.

“a moment to the influence of nature, though it be opposed to grace. This clergy, with few exceptions, are from the ranks of the people, they inherit their feelings.”—“*If a rebellion were raging from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of excommunication would ever be fulminated by a Catholic prelate.*”

Nor is this Letter the only proof which the same individual has given of the readiness of the present Roman-Catholic hierarchy of Ireland to enkindle the flames of civil discord in that devoted country. The Letters published with the abbreviated designation of his episcopal title,* contain more of the worst poison of sedition, than can be found, even in these days, in any other writings of equal bulk.

While, therefore, I see one of these prelates thus placing himself in the foremost ranks of the seditious array, I cannot join in the contempt, which it has been the fashion to express, for the proposed measure of a veto in the appointment to the Roman-Catholic sees in Ireland; and if it be wise to take counsel from the conduct or the language of an enemy, (as in all that relates to the Church of Rome, we may

* I. K. L.—James Kildare and Leighlin.

be sure it is,) we shall find increased reason for hoping, that the British legislature will demand this security, in the great, and, on all honest grounds, unaccountable, reluctance of the Irish prelates to grant it.

And here we are again brought to the evidence before the Committees, particularly that of Dr. Doyle, on

INTERFERENCE IN THE APPOINTMENT OF
IRISH ROMAN-CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

The Committee of the House of Commons asks, whether, "if temporalities were attached to the Roman-Catholic sees in Ireland, it would be inconsistent with the doctrine or discipline of that Church to admit any interference on the part of the Protestant Sovereign of this country in the appointments?" page 180. And Dr. Doyle distinctly answers, "*It would be inconsistent with the discipline of the Roman-Catholic Church to admit, in such cases, the interference of a Protestant Sovereign in such appointments.*" He afterwards adds, that by interference, he means "*all interference, direct or indirect.*"—p. 181.

The Committee, somewhat surprised apparently at this declaration, remind him that

“arrangements of that nature are admitted in some such cases, where the Sovereign is not a member of the Roman-Catholic Church.” Dr. Doyle answers, that “he knows of arrangements of that kind, though he does not know the nature of them exactly; that he is not acquainted with the circumstances of those other Protestant countries, but that knowing the state of his own country, he would resign his station in the Church rather than concur in such an arrangement, though it were considered by the Pope practicable, or even wise.”

“*Were the Sovereign of this realm a Catholic,*” he adds, “*I should be very averse to his having the appointment of Bishops vested in him; but his being of a different religion makes me think, that I could not, consistently at all with the principles of my religion, consent to his having any right to interfere directly or indirectly with the appointment of bishops.*”—*Ibid.*

To the former part of this sentence I will beg leave, in passing, to invite the particular attention of my Protestant readers. They contain a pregnant intimation (somewhat incautiously given, I suspect) of the real extent of Dr. Doyle’s scruples. “He would be averse even

“ to a Sovereign of his own religion having the “ appointment of Bishops vested in him;” in other words, he would not be satisfied with the state of things, as they stood in this country, or in Ireland, at any period of modern history. For never was there a time, when the constitution of these countries (at least since they have been under the same rule) permitted such a degree of independence in the hierarchy on the crown, as Dr. Doyle here informs us he should think necessary. I will not dwell on the point, I will only ask the admirers of this prelate, whether they seriously think that the judgment of a person so directly opposed to the fundamental principles of the British Constitution, do indeed deserve all the extravagant eulogies which have been heaped upon him.

And here his examination on this subject ceases for a while. It is subsequently revived (page 189) by the casual mention of Quarantotti's rescript, which, it will be remembered, conceded to the crown, under certain circumstances, a negative in the appointment of Irish R. C. Bishops. I will beg leave to follow this part of the examination rather minutely, as it presents a peculiarly happy specimen of Dr. Doyle's characteristic adroitness.

“ In that rescript, was not the power of the

“ crown to interfere with the nomination of
“ bishops, recognized as *not* inconsistent with
“ the discipline of the Catholic Church?”—A. “ It
“ was recognized *by a man who outstripped his*
“ *authority, who was incompetent to decide on a*
“ *matter of so much moment*: but though it had
“ happened to have proceeded from higher
“ authority in Rome, we would have acted as
“ we did; that is, the prelates would, for I was
“ not then a bishop, they would have remon-
“ strated, as they did.”

But the Committee, as Dr. Doyle finds, are not so manageable on this subject, as on matters more purely theological. “ Are we to understand from you,” they ask, “ that this rescript of Quarantotti’s did not come *from the see of Rome?*”—A. “ It did come from the see of Rome; but the Pope being then a prisoner in France, his spiritual jurisdiction was vested in certain persons, of whom Quarantotti was the third; and he, by the removal of the two before him, happened to remain in possession of those powers, and began to exercise them, and not being at all acquainted with our affairs, gave this rescript, upon an application from some interested person.” “ He was a cardinal, was he not?”—“ He was afterwards ap-

“ pointed a cardinal; *he had some merit with the Pope, but his appointment was not the reward of his conduct towards us.*”

We may remark, by the way, that although Dr. Doyle on some occasions exhibits the most edifying discretion in not presuming to judge how others, even of his own brethren, would act under given circumstances, yet he now and then has not the smallest objection to answer for the actions and motives of persons, over whom it does not appear that he has any direct influence whatever. In the present instance, whether Quarantotti's merits in this matter of the rescript were, or were not, such as to entitle him to the purple, at least his being advanced to that dignity looks as if the Pope did not agree with Dr. Doyle in his notion of the cardinal's demerits. But more of Quarantotti presently.

The Committee, being, I repeat, more intractable than usual, proceed to ask, “ Whether the witness is not aware, that *the principle* of that rescript *has been acted upon* in the concordats, which have taken place between the Pope and Protestant States; that it is a *doctrine recognised by the see of Rome* itself in treaties it has made?”—Dr. Doyle, who certainly is not dull of apprehension, is pleased to answer this

question in a manner, for which nothing but extreme dullness, or some less venial quality, can tolerably account.—A. “ Being ignorant of “ the circumstances of Russia and Prussia, I “ can *neither approve nor disapprove* what may “ have been done in treaties with those coun- “ tries.”

The Committee, however, will not here be cajoled. They press him again in still more pointed terms, and limit their inquiry now to Quarantotti's rescript to Dr. Doyle's own country, Ireland. “ Was not *the principle, upon which “ that rescript of Quarantotti was founded, the “ principle to which you say the Catholic pre- “ lates would object?*”—Still Dr. Doyle is not abashed: he determines to try one more experiment on the good sense or patience of the Committee, and has the confidence to answer them as follows. “ Being ignorant of *the treat- “ ties, I cannot say, whether the principle was “ the same, or not.*” (What had “ the treaties” to do with the question?) Happily, however, the Committee are here as firm, as Dr. Doyle is slippery; and they put to him a question, from which there is no escape, but in manifest prevarication. “ Is not the general principle “ in *that rescript, the interference of a Protestant*

“sovereign in the appointment of Bishops?”—
 A. “Circumstances affect principles so as almost
 “to change them in their operation. *I could*
 “*not therefore recognize the principle*, because it
 “may be so modified, as to be changed alto-
 “gether in its operation, from what it would
 “be, in the view we take of it, as regards our
 “own country.”

The question, we see, is on a matter of fact, whether such is the general principle in *that rescript*; the answer is, that the witness does not himself think it proper to recognize that principle:—and with this the Committee are contented. Perhaps, indeed, they could do no better, than to make the witness expose, beyond the possibility of gainsaying, his resolution not to give a plain answer to any questions which he wished to evade.

Let us now return to Quarantotti. He is made an object of contempt not only to Dr. Doyle, but also to Dr. Murray, who is pleased to call him “a very weak old man:” and the only apparent ground for all this indelicate abuse of an Ecclesiastic of their own Church, greatly their superior in rank and function, is his having forwarded this rescript to Ireland, acknowledging the fitness of giving to the crown a veto in

the appointment of Roman-Catholic Bishops. Dr. Doyle, we have seen, roundly asserts "that he outstripped his authority in doing this, and that he was incompetent to decide on a matter of so much moment."

Here the matter rested for a while; and if the Committee had depended for information solely on Dr. Doyle and Dr. Murray, they and the world would have been induced to believe, that this admission of a veto had never any higher authority than the much slandered Quarantotti. What then must have been the feelings of the Committee, what will be the judgment of the public, when informed, that *the Pope himself*, in an official letter through the prefect of Propaganda Fide, Cardinal Litta, dated Genoa, 26th April, 1815, *gave his express and formal assent to that very measure?* This is stated to the Committee by Mr. Phelan, page 484, and reluctantly admitted by Dr. Murray, page 650, when he is afterwards called in again for the very purpose, apparently, of removing the impression made by Mr. Phelan and other Protestant witnesses.

Thus then the case stands. Dr. Doyle affirms that "it would be" (not unwise, not inexpedient, but) "*inconsistent with the discipline of the Roman-Catholic Church* to admit any interference di-

“ rect or indirect of the Protestant Sovereign
“ of this country in the appointment of Roman-
“ Catholic bishops in Ireland.” He says this,
not as expressing his own private opinion, but
as a prelate solemnly delivering the recognized
doctrine of his Church—he says it, too, without
limitation or restriction, without implying, or
in any way intimating, that there is the slightest
doubt on the subject—much less, that the lan-
guage or practice of his Church has ever been
contrary to it:—and yet we find, that when Dr.
Doyle spoke thus, *he knew*, not only that the
Pope has made treaties with other Protestant
states, involving “ arrangements of that kind,
though Dr. Doyle knew not the nature of them
exactly;” not only, that even to Ireland a re-
script, recognizing and admitting such interfer-
ence in the strong form of a veto, had been sent
from the see of Rome by a person empowered
to execute the functions of the captive Pope—
but also *that the Pope himself had, in an official
letter, expressly approved and sanctioned the
granting of a veto to our own Protestant govern-
ment.*—And now let those who still doubt of
the illusory and disingenuous character of Dr.
Doyle’s evidence look back to the questions
cited from it above, page 493—5; let them see,
whether he does not there manifestly imply,

that the Pope has *not* given his sanction to the veto. Why else should he dwell on the hypothetical case, what the conduct of the Irish R. C. Bishops would be, *if* the Pope should give his sanction to such an arrangement? Why, too, should he say, or, rather, *how* could he say *with truth*, “ *I think the Pope would not sanction it*”?*

Such, then, is the result of Dr. Doyle’s examination on this subject before the Committee of the Lower House. His exhibition of himself before the Lords is not less remarkable. But in order that it should be fully appreciated, it is necessary I should remind my readers, that, previously to the Union with Ireland, Mr. Pitt proposed to give an independent provision to the Roman-Catholic clergy, receiving in return certain securities which were deemed by him indispensable. That proposal was communicated to the Roman-Catholic prelates of Ireland, who, having held a meeting in Dublin to deliberate on it, on the 17th, 18th and 19th of January, 1799, came to certain Resolutions, of which the following are all that are important to our present purpose.

“ It was admitted, that a provision, through government, for the Roman-Catholic Clergy of this Kingdom (Ireland), competent and secured, ought to be thankfully received.

* Commons, p. 180.

“ That, in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman-
 “ Catholic Religion to vacant sees within the kingdom, such
 “ *interference of government*, as may enable it to be satisfied of
 “ the loyalty of the person appointed, *is just, and ought to be*
 “ *agreed to.*

“ That, to give this principle its full operation, *without*
 “ *infringing the discipline of the Roman-Catholic Church*, or
 “ diminishing the religious influence which prelates of that
 “ Church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks,
 “ the following regulations seem necessary:—

“ First.—In the vacancy of a see, the clergy of the diocese
 “ to recommend, as usual, a candidate to the prelates of the
 “ ecclesiastical province, who elect him, or any other they may
 “ think more worthy, by a majority of suffrages.

“ Fourth.—*The candidates so selected to be presented* by the
 “ president of the election *to government*, which, within one
 “ month after such presentation, will transmit the name of the
 “ said candidate, if no objection be made against him, for ap-
 “ pointment to the holy see, or return the said name to the
 “ president of the election, for such transmission, as may be
 “ agreed on.

“ Fifth.—*If government have any proper objection against*
 “ *such candidates*, the president of the election will be informed
 “ thereof, within one month after presentation, *who, in that*
 “ *case, will convene the electors to the election of another can-*
 “ *didate.*

“ Agreeably to the discipline of the Roman-Catholic Church,
 “ these regulations can have no effect without the sanction of
 “ the Holy See, which sanction the Roman-Catholic prelates of
 “ this kingdom shall, as soon as may be, use their endeavours
 “ to procure.”

These resolutions were signed by the four Roman-Catholic Metropolitans and by six senior Bishops. The defeat of Mr. Pitt's project, as

far as it regarded the Roman-Catholics, prevented any degree of publicity being given to these resolutions, till the year 1808.

It will be remembered, that in May of that year, Dr. Milner, the accredited agent of the Irish Roman-Catholic prelates, authorized certain distinguished members of both houses of parliament to announce “the readiness of those prelates to concede to the crown an effectual negative in the appointment to Irish Roman-Catholic sees,” and that he afterwards disclaimed the authority which he was said to have given. It was not, however, till the following September, that the prelates assembled in Dublin resolved, that it was *inexpedient* to give such negative to the crown; and even then Dr. O’Reilly, their primate, answered the remonstrances of the Roman-Catholics of the county of Lowth against this decision, in a letter to Lord Southwell and Sir Edward Bellew, of which the following is the most important passage:—“I am CERTAIN, that *the prelates did not mean to decide that the admission of a veto on the part of the crown, with the consent of the Holy See, in the election of the Roman-Catholic bishops, would be contrary to the doctrine of the Roman-Catholic Church, or to any practice or usage essentially or indispensably*

“ connected with the Roman-Catholic religion:—
“ the objections, raised against a negative, are
“ of a temporary nature, resulting from existing
“ circumstances.”

Such was the language of the Roman-Catholic primate, in explanation of the decision to which himself and his brethren had come in September, 1808.

Of the discussions which followed—the statements and counter-statements—the speeches and pamphlets—the meetings for the purpose of questioning or applauding that decision, it is not necessary that I should say anything. But early in these discussions, the resolutions passed by the Prelates in 1799 were publicly brought forwards; and it is obvious, that they could not but form a most prominent and important object in the view taken by all, who bore a part in that long, eager, and scarcely yet terminated Controversy. In truth, they became, from the hour of their being made known, one of the most notorious and interesting particulars in the history of the Roman-Catholics of Ireland.

These matters it has been necessary to recount, in order to give full effect to the following *sworn* testimony of Dr. Doyle:—

“ Did not the Irish Roman-Catholic bishops,
 “ in 1799, and May, 1808, agree to give to this

“country the right of interference in the nomi-
 “nation of bishops?” A. “*I think* the resolu-
 “tion to which the question refers did not go
 “so far as the question supposes. *I believe*
 “they resolved, that it was reasonable to afford
 “to his Majesty the means of ascertaining the
 “loyalty of the person to be appointed to sees
 “in Ireland. Now, I conceive that such means
 “can be furnished to the sovereign without
 “granting to him a right to interfere directly
 “or indirectly with such appointment; and
 “therefore *I think that the bishops, who passed*
 “*the resolution to which the question refers, might*
 “*not have agreed to the principle of sanction-*
 “*ing a direct or indirect interference on the part*
 “of a Protestant sovereign with the appoint-
 “ment of bishops in the Catholic Church.”

Now this, it is manifest, was at least a very fortunate mode of disposing of the question. It did not commit the witness to any direct denial, and yet it would have been quite sufficient to get rid of the difficulty, if his examiners had been only tolerably accommodating. But the Lords (as Dr. Doyle has found in other instances) are sometimes very troublesome in their enquiries. In the present instance they propose the most distressing question imaginable. “Did

“not these bishops *retract* that consent in
“September, 1808, and February, 1810?”*

Here is an unfortunate position for our witness to be placed in! To deny the retraction is impossible; but to admit it, after his answer to the last question, would be no less than to admit that the Roman Catholic prelates had *retracted* a resolution, “that it was *reasonable to afford to his Majesty the means of ascertaining the loyalty of persons to be appointed to sees in Ireland.*” What could be done? A witness of ordinary ingenuity would have endeavoured to slide out of the dilemma in some such way as this: “I perceive that I must have been in error, when I answered the last question, and I request your lordships to ascribe it to my ignorance of the exact purport of the resolutions about which you enquire.” But not so Dr. Doyle. His spirit and resources rise with his difficulties; and he manfully proceeds to strike the most ingenious, as well as the boldest, stroke which the annals of impromptu testimony ever recorded.

“The retraction, I should suppose, ought to be understood of the resolution before passed, when taken in the sense in which your

* Lords, p. 228.

“ lordships seem to have understood it; but
 “ had it been understood in the sense in which
 “ it was meant or intended, when passed by
 “ them, probably they need never have passed
 “ a second resolution, which would seem to
 “ imply a retraction of the former.”

To comment on this answer would be superfluous. And so the noble examiners themselves appear to have thought. But the ingenuity of the witness entitled him to a little consideration; and, accordingly, some good-natured lord was pleased to cover his retreat with the following most satisfactory suggestions: “ Can you recollect the precise words of those resolutions?” “ I cannot recollect them.” “ You were not at the time a bishop of the Roman Catholic church?” “ I was not.”—p. 227.

So much for the resolutions of 1799. Dr. Doyle afterwards tells their lordships that to assent “ to the Crown of this Protestant country exercising any influence in the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops,” or to “ *permit a sovereign, professing a religion different from theirs, to interfere with the election of bishops,*” would be to “ *introduce a principle into the Catholic church, that has never been found to exist there before.*”—p. 228.

To set Dr. Doyle right in this particular, and

to satisfy the legislature, if they should ever think fit to insist on exercising such interference, that it is not unprecedented,* I will beg leave to state, on the authority of Roman Catholic writers, of Dr. O'Connor, and of Sandini Baronius, and Pagi, cited by him, that, in all cases, the confirmation, and, in some, the election, of the Popes themselves was exercised, with the assent of the Roman Church, by all the Gothic kings of Italy, whether Catholics or *Arians*, from the reign of Odoacer to the Emperor Justinian; and that the Greek emperors claimed and exercised the same privilege from the reign of Justinian to the Pontificate of Gregory III. A similar course is at this day pursued in all, or almost all, the Protestant states of continental Europe, as appears from the "Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Regulation of Roman Catholic subjects in foreign states," in the year 1816.

Nay, it further appears from the same authority, that our own government actually exercises this power in Canada, p. 478; and has received the thanks of the Chapter of Malta for "raising to the high episcopal dignity of

* Columbanus, *Let. I.* p. 58.

“ that diocese, a native of that island, and for
 “ assuring them that no other than a Maltese
 “ shall ever be bishop there.”—p. 486.

Really, with all these instances staring us in the face, we must be permitted to feel, and express, some degree of surprise at the hardihood of Dr. Doyle's assertions.

OATH TO THE POPE.

Nearly connected with the necessity of some adequate assurance of the loyalty of Roman Catholic prelates is a consideration of the oath by which they are bound to the Pope.

That oath is as follows: for I scruple not to burden my pages with a formula, which is, in every respect, most important, and cannot be too well known to every member of this Protestant state.

(The parts of this oath printed in Italics are additions made to the form of oath prescribed in the Decretal, lib. 2. tit. 24. ch. 10.)

“ I, N. N. Archbishop or Bishop of the church N. will
 “ henceforward be faithful *and obedient* to St. Peter the Apostle,
 “ and the Holy Roman Catholic Church, and to our Lord N.
 “ Pope, and his successors canonically instituted. I will not in
 “ council, in consent, or in deed, be accessory to their losing
 “ life or limb; or that they be taken by wrongful caption; or
 “ *violent hands, in any sort, be laid upon them; or any injuries*
 “ *inflicted, under any pretence whatever.* Moreover, the counsel
 “ which they shall entrust to me by themselves, or by their

" Nuncios, or by letters, I will not disclose to any one to their
 " loss *knowingly*. The Roman Papacy and *the Royalties of St.*
 " *Peter** I will assist them to retain, and defend (*salvo meo*
 " *ordine*) against every man. The Legate of the Apostolic
 " See, in his journeys to and fro, I will honorably entertain, and
 " will assist in all his needs. *The rights, the honors, privileges,*
 " *and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the*
 " *Pope, and of his successors aforesaid, I will take care to pre-*
 " *serve, defend, AUGMENT, and promote. Neither will I be in*
 " *counsel, nor in act, or enterprise, in which any things be*
 " *devised against the same our Lord, or the same the Church,*
 " *hurtful or prejudicial to their persons, right, honor, state, or*
 " *power. And if I shall know any such things treated of, or*
 " *prepared, I will hinder it, to the best of my power; and as soon*
 " *as I can, will signify it to the same our Lord, or to some other*
 " *by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the Holy*
 " *Fathers, decrees, ordinances, or dispositions, reservations, pro-*
 " *visions, and mandates Apostolic, I will observe with all my might,*
 " *and will make to be observed by others. When called to a*
 " Synod I will come, unless I shall be prevented by a canonical
 " impediment. The Apostolic residence I will visit† myself in
 " person every ten years; ‡ and to our Lord and his successors,
 " aforesaid, will render accout concerning my pastoral office,
 " and concerning all things to the state of my church, to the
 " discipline of my clergy and people, appertaining; and the man-
 " dates Apostolic given thereupon I will humbly receive, and with
 " all diligence perform. But if by any legitimate impediment I
 " shall be detained, all the things aforesaid I will fulfil by a sure
 " messenger, having special commission for that purpose, out of
 " the bosom of my chapter, or another placed in a dignity eccle-

* Regalia Petri is substituted in this modern oath for *regulas Sanctorum Patrum* in the oath in the Decretal.

† "Or by my sure messenger" is added in the Decretal, as also "unless I shall be released by their license."

‡ *Singulis annis* in the Decretal.

*“ nautical, or otherwise having a personage, or, in defect of
 “ these, by a diocesan priest ; and if there be no clergy, by some
 “ secular or regular Presbyter of tried probity and religion, fully
 “ instructed concerning all the things aforesaid. But, respecting
 “ the impediment aforesaid, I will give lawful proofs, to be trans-
 “ mitted through my said messenger to the Cardinal of the Holy
 “ Roman Church, prefect of the congregation De propaganda Fide.
 “ Moreover, the possessions to my table appertaining, I will not
 “ sell, nor give, nor pledge, nor put in feoffage anew, or in any way
 “ alienate, even under the consent of the chapter of my church,
 “ without first consulting the Roman Pontiff. These things all and
 “ severally I will the more inviolably observe, the more assured I
 “ am that nothing is contained therein which can conflict with my
 “ due fidelity towards the most serene King of Great Britain and
 “ Ireland, and the successors to his throne. So help me God,
 “ and these Holy Gospels of God.*

*“ So do I, N. N. Archbishop or Bishop of the church N.
 “ promise and engage.”*

Of this oath Dr. Curtis, Roman Catholic Primate of all Ireland, is pleased to say, “ It has
 “ been sometimes called an oath of allegiance,
 “ *but that is very false, it is not an oath of*
 “ *allegiance ;*” “ It is called the oath of *fidelity*,
 “ merely to distinguish it from the oath that
 “ every priest when ordained takes to the
 “ bishop, because it is to a higher personage ;
 “ but it means nothing more than *canonical*
 “ obedience, the obedience which the canons of
 “ the Church, or general councils, require to be
 “ paid to the Pope, as head of the Church.
 “ Not that we are to believe *it*, merely because

“ he says it ;” (q. what does *it* refer to?) “ no,
 “ we may remonstrate against any thing which
 “ we feel to be wrong.”*

Dr. Doyle says of the same oath,† “ We
 “ take the oath of *canonical obedience* to the Pope,
 “ *which means that we are to obey him as the head*
 “ *of the Church, according, or agreeably, to the*
 “ *discipline as found established in the sacred*
 “ *canons.*”

Now let me request my readers to examine the oath, and see whether there is any thing in it which limits the fidelity and obedience there promised, to the discipline established in the sacred canons? Will Dr. Curtis tell us what are the sacred canons, what the general councils, which command the particulars there recounted? Has he, or has Dr. Doyle, been pleased to point out the passages on which they rest their interpretation? Yes; Dr. Doyle has favoured us with the important clue—it is contained in the words “ *salvo meo ordine* ; which implies,” says he, “ that *the obedience which we promise to him is*
 “ *not to be understood so as to trench upon our own*
 “ *rights as Bishops, or any rights of the church*
 “ *in which we are bishops.*”

Really these three stout words have a very heavy burthen laid upon them, and they are

* Lords, p. 257.

† Ib. p. 224, 5.

placed in the most unaccountable of all possible positions to enable them to sustain it. Let my readers look back once more upon the oath, and examine whether, according to the ordinary use of language, any thing like Dr. Doyle's meaning can fairly be deduced from the little parenthesis, to which he does so much honour. The usual function of a parenthesis is to explain or limit the meaning of the particular sentence, or clause of a sentence, in which it is inserted. Accordingly, in the passage before us, the real application of *salvo meo ordine* must be sought in the words *defendendum contra omnem hominem*. "The Roman Papacy, and the regalia of St. Peter, I will assist them (the Popes) to retain and defend (*salvo meo ordine*) against every man;" in other words, to defend by *means and in a manner consistent with my order as a Bishop*. Such is the true force of *salvo meo ordine*; which seems here to mean no more, nor less, than the old exemption from personal military service, granted to the clergy;* and by taking the words in this their fair and natural order, the meaning of the whole becomes perfectly clear, instead of being, as it otherwise would be,

* As the canons attach *irregularity* to the shedding of blood, the clause "*salvo meo ordine*" exempts the bishops from personal service.

utterly irreconcilable with any ordinary rule of construction or grammar.*

The truth is that this oath is altogether of a feudal character. Its very language is feudal. Among other particulars, the phrase *nec de novo infeudabo*, applied to the temporal possessions there supposed, shews that the bishops hold their possessions as a feudal tenure of the Pope. The oath indeed had its origin not merely in the feudal times, but in the pretensions of the Pope to be the supreme feudal chief, of whom all temporal princes, even emperors and kings, were feudatories and vassals. After what I have already said I need not detain my readers by citing proof of the long existence of these pretensions. Dr. Doyle himself admits it, in the 6th and 7th section of his new "Essay." Nay, he goes further, he admits that this oath was first taken in the feudal times, though he ascribes a much earlier origin to it than can be conceded. He ascribes it to "an Englishman, Boniface, "Bishop of Mayence"—page 245. But the oath taken by Boniface (who lived in the eighth century) was of a very different tenor; it was nothing more than a declaration "to St. Peter,

* The Edinburgh Review is so delighted with this clause *salvo meo ordine*, and assents so cordially to Dr. Doyle's construction, that it prints it in the largest capitals.

“ and the Pope, that he holds and persists in
 “ the unity of the true faith; that he exhibits
 “ in every thing faith, purity, and co-operation
 “ with Peter and the utilities of his Church;
 “ that if he shall know of any prelates contra-
 “ vening the institutes of the ancient Holy
 “ Fathers, he will have no communion with
 “ them, but will denounce them to his Apostolic
 “ Lord.”*

* Vide Baron. ad ann. 723. Pontifex eum consecravit
 Episcopum; Et ut ad obedientiam sibi suisque successoribus ex-
 hibendam, omnemque sacræ fidei traditionem observandam arctius
 eum astringeret, juramentum ab eo exegit et accepit: quod
 quidem in antiquis exemplaribus ita scriptum habetur.

“ I, Boniface, Bishop by the grace of God, promise to thee,
 “ O blessed Peter, chief of the Apostles, and to thy blessed
 “ Vicar, Pope Gregory, and to his successors, by the Father,
 “ Son, and Holy Ghost, the Trinity inseparable, and this thy
 “ most sacred body, that I do exhibit all faith and purity to the
 “ Holy Catholic faith, and in the unity of the same faith, with
 “ the help of God, do continue, wherein all the salvation of
 “ Christians, without doubt, is proved to be: that in no way
 “ do I consent, under the persuasion of any one, against the
 “ unity of the common and universal Church; but, as I said,
 “ that I do in all things exhibit my faith, purity, and accordance
 “ to thee, and to the utilities of thy Church, to whom the
 “ power of binding and loosing has been given by God, and
 “ to thy Vicar aforesaid, and to his successors.

“ Moreover if I shall know of any prelates living contrary to
 “ the institutes of the ancient Holy Fathers, that with them I
 “ have no communion nor conjunction, but rather, if I should
 “ be able to prevent, I will prevent them; if not, I will faith-

The present is not an occasion to trace, by a lengthened detail, the growth of the feudal oath from this its feeble root to the full-grown vigorous plant, which presents itself to our view in the Roman Pontifical, and, with some inconsiderable alterations, in the formula now used in Ireland.

But there is a matter of recent history connected with it, which must not be omitted. It shews pretty plainly what is the real value ascribed at Rome to the notable addition, made by Pius VI. at the end of the oath, to satisfy or cajole the good people of England.

It appears (I quote from the Report of the House of Commons in 1816, page 313) that about the middle of the last century, the Court of Spain, notwithstanding its bigoted attachment to the Church of Rome, thought it necessary to secure the rights of the Crown against

“ fully immediately inform my Apostolic Lord. But if, which
 “ God forbid, I shall attempt to do any thing, in any way or
 “ intent, or occasion, contrary to the tenor of this my promise,
 “ may I be a convicted sinner at the everlasting judgment,
 “ may I incur the same vengeance as Ananias and Sapphira,
 “ who dared to act fraudulently towards you also in respect to
 “ their proper possessions. This form of oath likewise I,
 “ Boniface, a humble Bishop, have written with my own hand,
 “ and placing it on the most sacred body of St. Peter, as is
 “ prescribed, in the presence of God, my king and judge, have
 “ made oath, which also I promise to observe.”

the effects of such an allegiance sworn by Bishops to the Pope. An order, therefore, was made that "they should, in their oath of consecration, include the clause of fidelity to the King, and of deference to his prerogatives;" this has been effected by the following words added at the conclusion of the oath, "*Salvis regaliis, et legitimis consuetudinibus, usibus, concordiiis, legibus, et totâ subjectione domini mei Ferdinandi Hispaniarum et Indiarum Regis. Sic me Deus adjuvet, &c.*"

This is something like a security, and as opposite to the miserable subterfuge adopted in the Irish oath, as plain dealing is to Jesuitical finesse. But the most curious and instructive particular remains to be told; and it stands on the same high authority as what has preceded. On the restoration of the present King of Spain in 1814, the Pope (trusting probably to his Majesty's avowed and excessive deference to any ordinance of the Church) directed his Nuncio to present a Note from the Holy See, "*wherein it was required, that the above-cited clause respecting the obedience and deference to the royal prerogatives, should be omitted in the oath taken by the Archbishops and Bishops of Spain at the time of their consecration.*" His Holiness was, however, dis-

appointed; even the council of Ferdinand VII. in all the fervour of their devotion to Catholicism, and under circumstances the most propitious to his suit that could be devised, refused to gratify him; and yet English statesmen are confidently asked to blind themselves to the dangerous character of an oath, which even Spain, in this its darkest day, is not content to endure without a real and effective limitation.

I will not examine all the particulars in the oath, as it stands at present, nor state all the objections which might be fairly urged against it; such an undertaking would require a volume of itself. But I must be allowed to dwell a little on one of its clauses, and to ask its advocates how we are to understand, and in what manner they will defend it. "All the rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope and of his successors, I will take care to preserve, defend, augment, and promote."

Now, the legitimate and generally admitted rule of interpreting an oath, is, that it be observed in the sense, in which he, who takes it, knows that it is understood by him to whom it is taken. Accordingly, Dr. Doyle himself has told us,* first, in the words of St. Thomas Aqu-

* Essay, &c. p. 164, 5.

nas, “ *Debet juramentum servari secundum intellectum ejus, cui juramentum præstatum:*” and, afterwards, in his own, “ This is the doctrine of Catholics, which it is a crime to depart from. *An oath must be kept according to the meaning of him who administers it, or to whom it is sworn.*” -

In the present instance, the Pope is he who administers the oath, and to whom it is sworn. According to his sense, therefore, its clauses are to be understood and observed. Regarding the matter thus, will Dr. Doyle and Dr. Curtis tell us, what is the sense in which the Pope understands “ the rights, honours, privileges, and “ authority” here mentioned? This is a matter of no difficult research. There are bulls upon bulls, from the “ *Unam sanctam*” of Boniface the Eighth, down to the “ *Auctorem Fidei*” of Pius VI. all which assert and maintain the right of the Pope to, at least, indirect power in the temporal concerns of States. In particular, the bull in *Cœna Domini*, of which I have already* given some account, and of which Dr. Doyle himself does not venture to deny, that it is still esteemed in force at Rome,† asserts a multiplicity of rights utterly inconsistent with the sovereignty or the independence of any

* See above, p. 473.

† Lords, p. 312.

civil government. It is notorious, that *these are the rights, which the Pope, the party to whom the oath is taken, understands to be implied in the clause in question, these therefore are the rights, which, according to Dr. Doyle's own rule, (and a very sound rule it is,) every Roman Catholic Bishop at his Consecration binds himself on oath "to preserve, augment, and promote."*

If further evidence were wanted of the sense in which the Popes understand these rights, it would not be difficult to produce it in abundance. But I will not have recourse to any document, on which a reasonable question can be raised. I will refer to one of the most authoritative, which can be named, no less than the Breviary itself. It may be unknown to some of my readers, that Pius V. who, besides having burned more heretics than almost any of his predecessors, is notorious in history for renewing and amplifying the bull in *Cœna Domini*, and ordering it to be published on Maundy Thursday in all Roman Catholic churches (its publication having hitherto been limited to Rome); this Pius V., who further signalized himself by issuing the bull of excommunication against our own Queen Elizabeth, and depriving her of her crown; this pontiff, thus distinguished in history, was, about a cen-

tury ago, exalted to the rank of *Saint*; a solemn Festival is appointed to his honour, and in one of the lessons of the day the highest particular in the climax of his praises is “his unconquerable vigour in vindicating the *rights* of the “Apostolic See!” We have seen what his judgment of these rights was: and that judgment is accepted and hallowed in the very devotions of the Church of Rome. After this, can we with decency be told that the Bishop, who swears to preserve and augment those rights, may understand them in as lax and accommodating a sense, as Drs. Curtis and Doyle would wish us to believe?

But Pius V. is not the only Pope who has been canonized for his vigour in these matters. A name, far more eminent than his, the noted Hildebrand,—that Gregory VII. who claimed the universal dominion of the world as an appendage of his See,—whose whole life was one unceasing effort to realize this claim,—who was as little turned aside from the prosecution of his holy purpose by considerations of his own safety, as by a regard for the peace and tranquillity of mankind,—that Gregory, of whom Dr. Doyle himself says, that the unhappy Rodolph, (who had been set up by him to fill the Imperial throne, of which he had deprived the

lawful owner,) when about to pay the forfeit of his crime, “ confessed that, induced thereto by “ the Pope, he had rebelled against his sove-
 “ reign,”*—that Gregory, of whom Dr. Doyle further tells us, on the authority of the chronicler Sigebert, that “ when he found himself
 “ near his end, he acknowledged that *he had,*
 “ *at the instigation of the Devil, stirred up enmi-*
 “ *ties and strife amongst mankind,* and sent to
 “ the emperor to solicit his forgiveness,”†—that very Gregory, of whom the most charitable judgment which can be passed, is that he was a crack-brained fanatic,—was, in the eighteenth century, by Benedict XIII. placed among the Saints!—a holy service was appointed to his honour,—all good Catholics were called upon to bend the knee in adoration to him,—and the worship of God himself was profaned by thanking him for giving this firebrand to the world, and by *praying that his example might still edify and strengthen the Church.*

It is true, this monstrous proceeding was reclaimed against by every government in communion with Rome; France, and even Spain,

* Dr. Doyle's Essay, &c. p. 53.

† Ibid.—Dr. Murray, in his Evidence before the Commons, p. 651, says the same. Baronius, it appears, denies what Sigebert affirms.

expressed their indignation in the loudest terms, —the bull of canonization was every where on the continent, out of Italy, forbidden to be published, and the Breviaries for the use of other countries are not disgraced by the name and the worship of Hildebrand. But Rome was not left without one nation of faithful adherents, even in this wild experiment on the credulity of mankind. *Ireland accepted the worship of the new Saint, and St. Gregory VII. still figures in her Calendar, and has a distinguished place in her Breviary.*

This is admitted by Dr. Murray in his evidence before the Commons; but he tells the Committee, (p. 651,) “ that the Church does “ not canonize all the actions of even the Saints “ themselves;” — “ that Gregory VII. distinguished himself by the most indefatigable “ zeal in reforming the Church, which was then “ subject to great disorders, particularly with “ regard to simony; and *in every other respect,* “ though he may have acted under mistaken “ impressions regarding the particular point “ before alluded to,” (that of the right of deposing monarchs,) “ he was considered a most “ holy man, and as such is venerated by the “ Church.”

I will not stop to ask Dr. Murray, what was

the general tenor of this pontiff's life; but I demand of him, what are the qualities, what the services to the Church, for which he was canonized, and which are commemorated in the Collect and Lessons of his holy day? Is it his hatred of simony,—his zeal for reformation? Dr. Murray knows the contrary; he knows that these particulars are very lightly touched, and that the main honours are given to qualities and to acts of a very different kind: and yet, as we have seen, he scruples not to insinuate to the Committee who examined him, that Hildebrand was sainted, only for those merits which, if they were his, all the world would join in applauding.

But it is right, that I should give some fuller account (at the hazard of being tedious) of the religious honour paid to St. Gregory VII. in the Breviary of Rome and *Ireland*: I do so, because in the Breviaries generally met with, published for the use of other countries, no notice whatever is taken of him.

The prayer is as follows:—“ O God, the
 “ strength of all who hope in Thee, who didst
 “ fortify with the virtue of constancy, for the de-
 “ fence of the liberty of the Church, thy blessed
 “ Confessor and Pontiff Gregory; grant to us,
 “ that *by his example* and intercession, *we may*

“ *bravely overcome all that is opposed to us.—*
 “ *Through the Lord.*”

Such is the prayer. In the first of the proper Lessons appointed for the day we read as follows: “it is said, that when he was a boy, and
 “ yet ignorant of letters, being at play in a
 “ carpenter’s shop, he made out of scraps
 “ of wood (*God guiding his hand*) the letters
 “ which formed this oracle of David—‘ his do-
 “ ‘ minion shall be from sea to sea,’—in order
 “ that it might be signified that his authority in
 “ the world would be most extensive.”

Another of the Lessons I will give entire:—

“ On the death of Alexander II. being unanimously elected
 “ to succeed him as Pope, though much against his will, *he*
 “ *shone forth like the sun in the House of the Lord*: for power-
 “ ful as he was both in action and in speech, he devoted him-
 “ self so entirely to the restoration of Ecclesiastical Discipline,
 “ to the re-establishment of Ecclesiastical Liberty, to the extir-
 “ pating of errors and corruptions, that since the times of the
 “ Apostles no Pontiff has been known to have incurred greater
 “ labours and troubles in the cause of the Church of God, or to
 “ fight more manfully for its liberty. Some provinces he
 “ cleansed from the stain of simony. Against the impious at-
 “ tempts of the Emperor Henry he remained through every
 “ fortune a bold and fearless champion. He was not afraid to
 “ place himself before the wall of the house of Israel; and
 “ *this same Henry, who had fallen* into the abyss of evil, *he*
 “ *deprived of the communion of the faithful, and of his kingdom,*
 “ *and released the nations subject to his sway from the fidelity*
 “ *which they had sworn to him.*”

“ Whilst he was performing mass a Dove was seen by pious

“witnesses to descend from Heaven, and perching on his right shoulder, to cover his head with its outspread wings: by which it was signified, that *in the government of the Church he was guided by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit*, not by considerations of human prudence”—“a man truly holy, the avenger of crimes, and the most strenuous defender of the Church: and having thus passed twelve years in the Papedom, he departed into Heaven in the year of grace 1085, illustrious both in his life and after his death for many miracles.”*

Such is the service recently appointed to be read in honour of St. Gregory VII. a Saint, *who, rejected by every other portion of Papal Europe, is acknowledged only in Rome and Ireland:* and Dr. Murray, although in the habit of joining in this service, on the 25th of May of every year, affects to ascribe Gregory’s canonization to “the extraordinary zeal which he testified in *reforming the corruptions of the Church!*”

The same prelate, in the same part of his examination, is pleased to throw a new light on another matter of some interest to protestants, I mean,

THE THIRD CANON OF THE FOURTH COUNCIL
OF LATERANE,

In which (it will be remembered) the duty of exterminating heretics is declared.

* Breviar. Rom. Prati, 1721. Pars Æstiv. p. 352. Die 25 Maij.

Dr. Murray tells the Committee of the House of Commons, (page 658) that "it is exceedingly doubtful, whether or not that canon was ever enacted in the Council of Laterane; for no ancient manuscript records it;" and, being subsequently asked, (page 661,) upon what authority he supposes the canon to be not authentic—"It is mentioned," he says, "by some historians, (and particularly Collier is referred to,) as spurious, and as not having been contained in any ancient manuscript:" but, on the Committee suggesting to him, that Collier rather states that there is controverted authority upon the point," he admits that he has not himself had an opportunity of consulting Collier—that he speaks merely from reference made to him."

Dr. Doyle, in his sworn testimony before the Lords, has not been quite so diffident. He has said (page 310,) that "*the Canon is not found in the acts of the Council at all!*" meaning, I really cannot presume to guess what: for it appears in every printed Edition of the Council's Acts, and in none, as far as I know, is there the slightest intimation of any doubt of its being genuine.

Dr. Doyle also tells the Lords, that "this Canon is supposed by *most* historians to have

“ been attached to the Council's Acts.” Indeed! Will Dr. Doyle have the goodness to tell us who these historians are? it has been my own fortune in looking into historians for the purpose of ascertaining this fact, to find them all either citing the canon, or tacitly admitting its genuineness. Such is the case not only with Protestant Historians, but also with Dupin and Fleury.

But Dr. Doyle ventures to name one of his authorities—“ It is supposed,” says he, “ amongst others, by the very excellent historian, Collyer.”—My readers are by this time sufficiently acquainted with Dr. Doyle, to feel no surprize when they are informed, that this “ very excellent historian” supposes no such thing. But in preference to giving any remarks of my own on this point, I will beg leave to quote part of the evidence of the Archbishop of Dublin.* The Committee, giving credit apparently to Dr. Doyle's sworn statement, propose to the Archbishop the following question. Q. “ Notwithstanding the authorities which your grace has quoted in defence of that third Canon, the opinion and argument of Collier go to cast it out of the Council of Laterane, to prove that it never formed a part of the third Canon of

* Lords, 457.

“ that Council?”—A. “ I do not think they do.
 “ I think, as a plain historian, he is content
 “ with relating a simple fact; he rather gives
 “ his own opinion in favour of the Canon, when,
 “ in selecting the Canons of the greatest influ-
 “ ence, he selects three only; and this, as one
 “ of those three. He says, ‘ the English Church
 “ ‘ being represented at this Council, I shall
 “ ‘ lay two or three of its most remarkable
 “ ‘ Canons before the reader;’ and then he
 “ adds, ‘ but here it must be said, that this
 “ ‘ Chapter or Canon is not to be found in the
 “ ‘ Mazarine copy coeval with the Council, but
 “ ‘ is transcribed from a later record:’ thus
 “ asserting the fact simply, that it was not
 “ found in the Mazarine record, but in a later
 “ one.”*

So much for this abortive attempt to prove

* But the Archbishop explains the fact respecting even the Mazarine copy, in a manner, which leaves no fair doubt of the Canon having been originally contained in it. “ The Mazarine copy is stated to be, in several parts of it, mutilated: the leaf torn. Accordingly, as is visible on inspection, the first Canon is wanting in the Mazarine copy; part of the second only is had, and part of the third. Of the third, the beginning and end are in the Mazarine copy; but the middle is not, being as much as occupies a leaf in the codex. *Therefore, this particular act of the Council is not, in the ordinary sense of the word, wanting in the Mazarine copy.*”

before the Committee, that the third Canon of the great Laterane Council is not genuine. The only convert to this notion ever likely to be made is the exemplary critic, who "feels it his duty to investigate each fact of the case, and, above all, not to take doctrines of the Catholics at second-hand"—in short, the Edinburgh Reviewer, who says, "Catholics do not hold themselves obliged to believe in the deposing doctrine upon anything declared in this Canon, because it is generally considered to be spurious."—(No. LXXXV. p. 141.)

And now let me trespass on my reader's patience, while I briefly recapitulate what these several personages have said on this subject. Delahogue had first intimated in a note to his Tract. de Ecclesiâ, page 263, (the Class-book, as I have before said, at Maynooth) that "*some Critics doubt* of the authenticity of this Canon: see Collyer, a Protestant writer, Dupin, and Turnelius de Eccl." Dr. Murray, eagerly avails himself of this doubt, and produces it before the House of Commons; when lo! what was simply a doubt with Delahogue, grows to be "*exceedingly doubtful*" in the hands of Dr. Murray; "by *some historians*," he adds, "*particularly Collyer, it is mentioned as spurious.*"—Dr. Doyle goes further. He says, that "*by*

“*most historians,*” (Collyer is the only one whom he too names, and we have seen what Collyer’s statement amounts to,) “*by most historians this Canon is supposed to have been attached to the Council’s Acts.*”—Last of all comes the northern Reviewer, and he boldly declares, that “*the Canon is generally considered to be spurious.*”—Really it would not be easy to find another specimen, half so complete, “of the progress of—” what I have too much respect for my readers and myself to call by its right name.

But I have not yet done with Dr. Doyle on this subject. Not satisfied with the result of his endeavours to discredit the Canon before Parliament, he has devoted two sections of his recent “*Essay*” to the same laudable pursuit. He even enters into “a critical examination” of it, and in order to bear down all opposition, announces that “he shall consult only such authorities as ought not to be passed by; and that the general tenor of his observations will be almost copied from a few of *some fifty books* now lying before him, which, among other things, treat of this Council.” This is an awful declaration, and makes it a matter of fearful odds against any one, who, like myself, ventures into the field without a fifth part of the

same artillery. I have, however, one ally which is itself a host, a resolution to follow truth wherever she may lead me.

He begins with saying, that "this decree appears in the Acts of the Council itself as published at Lyons, by Caranzan, in 1683, as well as (he believes) in all others of a *modern* date."

It also appears, he tells us, in "an Edition of the Councils published by Crabbe, the Franciscan, in 1558," which Edition was, he says, Crabbe's *second*: and yet Crabbe published an Edition in 1538, in which the third Canon appears with the rest; and another in 1551, in which also it appears. But then, Dr. Doyle tells us, in an Edition (which he calls Crabbe's *first* Edition) "published in 1530, by James Merlin, the Canon does not appear." Very true; neither does it, I believe, appear in Dr. Doyle's Pastoral Address of 1822: in which, however, it would be equally reasonable to look for it. For James Merlin's Edition of 1530, does not profess to be an Edition of all the Councils, but only of a very few, and the fourth Council of Laterane is not in the number. I say this, on the supposition that the publication of J. Merlin's, intended by Dr. Doyle, is that which is entitled *Conciliorum quatuor* Ge-

neralium, Tom. I. *Aliorum aliquot Conciliorum Generalium*, Tom. II. Col. 1530.

It is possible, to be sure, (but till Dr. Doyle produces better proof, I shall not believe it,) that Merlin may have published in the same year another edition by Crabbe, of the Councils in General. But if he did, there is no mention of it in the edition of 1538, which nevertheless speaks of a Collection of the Councils in a single volume, published twice at Paris, and once at Cologne. But let us suppose that one of these was the edition meant by Dr. Doyle, and then see whether the result will be more to that Prelate's honour. At the end of the second volume of 1538, is an address to the reader by Orthuinus Gratius, stating, that the former collection was very carelessly edited, that almost all things in it were corrupted, and no method or order observed; but "in this Collection," he proceeds, "every thing is complete, and drawn from the most ancient, received, and, what is especially worthy of note, approved copies. Read, therefore, again and again, these volumes, in which you will find many councils of the ancients, which to this day the greatest and most learned men have been unable to procure." Accordingly an index is given, at the beginning of the first volume,

“ the Pope, sixty Chapters or Canons were
 “ read in full sitting, but which seemed to
 “ *many (onerosa) not acceptable*, and then they
 “ proceeded to what related to the Holy
 “ Land.” Dr. Doyle has here again judged it
 expedient to omit part of his author’s words;
 which are at least as important, as those which
 he retains, *aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa*
 —and which are thus applied by Dupin—“ it is
 “ certain that these Canons were not *made* by the
 “ Council, but by Innocent III. who presented
 “ them to the Council ready drawn up, and
 “ ordered them to be read, and that the Pre-
 “ lates did not enter into debate upon them,
 “ but that their silence was taken for approba-
 “ tion.” Accordingly, Dupin himself gives the
 Canons (and of course the third among the
 rest) without hesitation, or further remark, as
 the Canons of the Council: and yet Dupin;
 next to Collyer, is the principal witness relied
 on by Delahogue. (the original propounder of
 the doubt) against the genuineness of this third
 Canon.

But, after all, is Dr. Doyle sincere in this his
 new attempt? Does he recollect that if his
 argument is good for anything, it goes (as I
 have said) to destroy the authority of *all* the
 Canons of this Council alike? and then what be-

comes of the authority of the Council of Trent itself, which actually cites by name a Canon of this "Great Council," (respecting confession) in one of its own most solemn Decrees of Faith? Really, I begin to tremble for this great Divine's own orthodoxy.

Must this Canon of Lateran detain us any longer? I am sorry to say it must: for Drs. Murray and Doyle, like prudent generals, have a main part of their force in reserve. They say, that even if this Canon is genuine, it is no part of the general doctrine or discipline of the Church: that "this law was enacted to repress the errors of the Albigenses, † which threatened the existence of society itself."

This is the most surprizing discovery of all. These people, against whom this Canon was directed, are not once named in the Canon itself, nor in any of the Council's acts. To be sure, there was a Laterane Council held forty years before (1179), under Alexander III. against these very Albigenses, and a Decree of that Council sufficiently accords with Dr. Murray's description of the acts of this fourth Laterane. But is it possible that the former

* Sess. xiv. c. 8.

† See Commons, p. 659, and Dr. Doyle's "Essays," p. 93.

‡ Can. 27. Concil. Labbe. Venet. 1734. t. xiii. p. 430.

Principal of Maynooth College, and the present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, could be guilty of so gross a blunder, (I will not call it by a harsher name,) as confounding the two? Let us, however, suppose, that though the Albigenses are not named by the Council, they were (as is highly probable) intended. Did they *alone* fall within the Canon in question? Most certainly not. The Canon sets out with saying—"we excommunicate and anathematize "*every* heresy erecting itself against this *orthodox* faith, which we have above laid down, condemning all heretics (*universos hæreticos*) by "whatever names they are known."

Now, then, in order to see who are affected by this sweeping anathema, we must look to that exposition of orthodox faith to which we are referred, and which is given in the first Canon "de fide Catholicâ." And here I have to announce to my Protestant readers, that we are all most unquestionably included: for among other articles of faith is that which first authoritatively pronounced the belief of transubstantiation to be necessary to salvation. We are all, therefore, liable to the censures and punishments pronounced in the third Canon! And so I have done with it, I hope, for ever.

Our next subject must be

THE PROCEEDING OF THE COUNCIL OF CON-
STANCE AGAINST JOHN HUS.

It has been not unusual to regard this case as one which proves that the Church of Rome has maintained the tenet, that "faith is not to be kept with heretics." I do not myself think that this conclusion is fairly deducible from it, and I have expressed myself accordingly in my Letters to you, page 294. The legitimate deduction is rather, if I mistake not, the superiority of the ecclesiastical over the temporal power. One or other of these principles, however, cannot but result from it.

But let us look to the evidence :

Dr. Murray* defends this proceeding at Constance by saying, in the first place, that "the safe-conduct given by the Emperor to Hus proves, on being examined, to be nothing more than *a mere travelling passport*, such as is now given so commonly upon the continent, to protect the individual possessing it from interruption on the way;" and, secondly, that "the Emperor's safe-conduct could not protect, and could not have been intended to protect,

* Commons, p. 659.

“ him from the operation of the laws of a *free city, over which the Emperor could not be supposed to have controul.*”

I will examine both these particulars, and I hope to bring my observations upon them within a moderate compass.

And, first, of the safe-conduct, the “mere passport,” as Dr. Murray calls it. It is addressed by Sigismund “to all ecclesiastical and secular princes, &c. &c. to all the governors and officers of cities, &c. and to the rest, our and the Holy Empire’s subjects and lieges— We recommend *in full affection* to all and every of you, the honourable Master John Hus, S. T. B. the bearer of these presents, passing from the kingdom of Bohemia to the Council of Constance now about to be holden, *whom also we have received into the protection and safeguard of us and the Holy Empire*: desiring that when he shall come to you, you, both out of free will and duty, receive him graciously, treat him with favour, and in things which relate to the speed and security of his journey shew a readiness to forward him; also that you permit himself, with his servants, horses, and all other things belonging to him, through all your passes, ports, bridges, lands, domains, jurisdictions, cities, &c. *without any payment of*

“ *tribute, toll, or any other burthen whatsoever,*
“ *and, every impediment whatsoever removed,*
“ *to pass, stop, sojourn, and return freely; and that*
“ *you of free will and of duty provide for the safe-*
“ *conduct of him and his, when there shall be*
“ *need, in honor and reverence of our Majesty.*
“ *Given at Spire, A. D. 1414, Oct. 18.”*

Such was the safe-conduct; and I request my readers to compare it with Dr. Murray's statement, that it was “ a *mere travelling passport,*” “ such as is now so commonly given on the “ continent.” I certainly shall not labour this point further.

But the main defence of the Council and the Emperor is rested, both by Dr. Murray, in his evidence, and Dr. Doyle, in his “ *Essay,*” page 131, on the entire independence of the city of Constance, where the Council was holden, and where Hus was burnt. Dr. Doyle, indeed, has the hardihood to say, that the Council in its “ *Decree* declared that there was no violation “ of faith in this case, by whatever tie the Emperor, in giving the safe-conduct, might bind “ himself; whereas he had no power to prejudice the rights of the Council in giving “ judgment in a matter of doctrine, *nor those of* “ *the magistrates of Constance, a free and inde-*

*“pendent city, in the execution of their own
“ sanguinary laws.”*

I call on Dr. Doyle to produce this decree. If he cannot, what must be the merits of that cause, which needs the assistance of such an artifice? What the principles of that advocate who can dare to use it? He has not here the palliation which might, in other instances, be suggested, that he was taken unawares, called on to answer questions on the instant, without time for due reflection. He has taken months to meditate his statement, and now voluntarily comes forth to publish it.

But that statement is most unfounded. Not only does the Council's decree not confirm it, it does not say a single syllable which concerns the magistrates of this free city; the tribunal of which it speaks, and of which it declares that the safe-conduct of Sigismund could not interfere with its jurisdiction, is “a competent “and ecclesiastical” tribunal. Nay, there is certain proof that the city of Constance was not in such a sense “free,” as to exclude the paramount authority of the Emperor.

Naucerus, in his Chronicle, ad ann. 1413, (a writer cited by Dr. Doyle himself, “Essay,” page 122, as one of more than common weight,)

tells us, that the circumstance of "the Legate's
" having fixed on Constance as the place for the
" Council gave great delight to the Emperor,
" because *it was a city subject to him.* But when
" the Pope, John XXIII. understood this, it is
" incredible how deeply he grieved, cursing
" himself and his fortune." And Nauclerus
himself ascribes so much importance to this
particular that he adds, " But the will of God no
" man can resist; and God had already decreed
" that there should be one fold and one shep-
" herd;" alluding to the deposition of John
which should take place at Constance.

Nor is this all. In the documents published
with the acts of the Council by Labbe, there is
abundant proof of the Emperor's power and
authority at Constance. He himself says, in
the edict by which he invites all whom it
concerns to the Council, that " Constance has
" been named by himself as a fit place, safe;
" and common to all nations who may attend;
" and in which we shall be able, *according to our*
" *imperial office,* to protect all and every one in
" full liberty."*

There is moreover the form of an oath which
Sigismund, "in virtue of his royal Majesty,

* Labbe, *Con. Venet.* 1731. vol. xvi. p. 793.

“ *commande* the Syndics, &c. of Constance to “ take ;” an oath which the Pope had required for the safety of himself and his suite. The syndics having taken the oath, Sigismund’s commissary gives his sanction and authority to the same.*

But, be the rights and liberties of the city of Constance what they may, Sigismund was the secular power on whom the Council devolved the duty of inflicting its execrable vengeance upon Hus ; this is rendered indisputable by the sermon preached before the Council on that occasion, by James, Bishop of Lodi, “ Master of the “ Sacred Palace.” In it we read the following address to Sigismund ; “ On all these accounts, “ to thee, O most Christian King, the glorious “ triumph hath been reserved, a triumph to be “ celebrated in all times to come, of repairing “ the lacerated Church, removing so inveterate “ a schism, and outrooting the heretics.” “ To “ complete this, so holy and so pious a work, “ thou hast been chosen by God ; especially “ that the heresies and errors which we have “ even now condemned, should be destroyed by “ thy imperial sword. Destroy then all heresies “ and errors ; and above all, this obstinate

* Labbe, Con. Venet. 1731. vol. xvi. p. 798.

“ heretic, (Hus,) through whose malignity many
 “ are the places which have been infected by
 “ the contagion of heresy. This sacred labour
 “ is left to thee, O glorious Prince; to thee,
 “ above all, it belongs, to whom is given *the*
 “ *supreme power of justice* (justitiæ primatus);
 “ wherefore, from the mouths of babes and
 “ sucklings, thy praises are sounded forth per-
 “ petually, that thou mayst destroy the ene-
 “ mies of the Church. And may Christ Jesus;
 “ who is blessed evermore, vouchsafe to grant
 “ that this may redound to thy happiness and
 “ prosperity. Amen.”*

Accordingly, when the process against Hus
 was ended, when he was declared a heretic,
 and the Council pronounced its decree, that
 “ the Church of God having nothing more which
 “ it could do, he was now to be left to the
 “ secular power,” Sigismund, as this secular
 power, gave his order to Louis, Elector Palatine
 of Bavaria, Grand Vicar of the Empire, to
 receive him in charge. Louis received and
 immediately gave him over to the officers. But
 while he was at the stake, and before the fire
 was yet kindled, Louis and the Count of Papen-
 heim rode up to him, and urged him to recant
 and save his life.† So clearly was his death

* Ibid. p. 1326.

† Hussit. His. l. ii: p. 111.

the act of Sigismund, and so little ground is there for the shallow pretence of Delahogue and his Irish adherents, that, "the laws of the free city of Constance, laws which the safe-conduct of Sigismund could not controul; were the real authority under which he suffered."

The truth is, as I have intimated before, that the main principle on which the Council acted, was the superiority of the ecclesiastical to the temporal power. This principle is recognized as of course by the old historians of the Church of Rome. In particular, Dr. Doyle's own authority, Nauclerus, tells us that Sigismund himself had scruples, and how they were overcome. "The burning of Hus and Jerome," says he, "the Emperor took much to heart, on account of the safe-conduct granted to them. But the Council answered him, that he could not be charged with breach of faith, because the Council itself, which is greater than the Emperor, not having granted a safe-conduct, he had not the power to grant it against the will of the Council; a determination in which, as a good son of the Church, Sigismund acquiesced."* The same principle had been

* Nauclerus, vol. iii. p. 442.

inculcated in a sermon by the Cardinal of Cambray, who, choosing for his text "there shall be signs in the Sun, and in the Moon, and in the Stars," made the Pope to be "the Sun presiding over the day, that is, spiritual things, the Emperor to be the Moon, presiding over night, that is, temporal things."* Nay, so fully was Sigismund himself imbued with this notion, that in a letter addressed by him to Charles VI. of France, inviting him to send his ambassadors to the Council, this traitor to his own imperial crown adopts the same image: "God," says he, "has placed two luminaries over the earth, a greater and a less, by which the authority of the Pope and the powers of kings are designated, the one ruling in spirituals, the other in corporeals."†

So much for the proceeding of the Council of Constance against Hus. But Dr. Doyle is not content to defend the Council, without libelling its illustrious victim: "There was," he says, "scarcely any thing *impious* which the unhappy Hus did not maintain." Impious! I challenge this bold defamer to produce from the writings of Hus, not from the fictions of

* L'Enfant, Hist. du Concile de Constance, t. i. p. 77.

† Labb. Cou. ubi supra, p. 795.

his accusers, a single tenet in which the faintest taint of impiety can be discerned. If he refuses, let the shame of convicted calumny,—I will not measure and weigh my words in repelling a charge, as false as it is foul, from the memory of that holy martyr,—let the shame, I say, of convicted calumny teach Dr. Doyle in future to be discrete, at least, if he will not be honest. The tenets of John Hus “impious!” so then are the tenets of every true son of the Church of England! for, with the exception of some erroneous, but assuredly not impious, notions, the doctrines which he held in opposition to Rome, we too maintain or tolerate. In truth, the name of Hus is one which to English Protestants must ever be most dear. It was from England, from our own countryman Wicliff, that he first caught the flame of pure religion; and well and largely did he repay the debt, by keeping that holy light still burning, and transmitting it purer and brighter to the Fathers of our own Reformation. Above all, by his blessed example at the stake, he taught a lesson which even Ridley and Cranmer might be proud to learn. For never, to human observation, was the crown of martyrdom more gloriously won, never by mortal man was the conflict with all the powers of earth and hell sustained with more undaunted con-

stancy, more genuine Christian meekness, humility, and charity.* Yet against this man, after more than four hundred years have passed since he paid the last dreadful price of his resistance to the tyranny of Rome, the intolerance of that Church is still, it seems, fresh and active; it can calumniate, though it may no longer persecute; it can direct the envenomed pens of such writers as Dr. Doyle, though the pile can be no longer reared, and the Halls of Justice spurn from them the bloody code, which bigotry would have made perpetual.

From the cruel and treacherous murder of Hus, the transition is easy to our next subject,
THE DOCTRINE OF EXCLUSIVE SALVATION IN
THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Of all the distinguishing characteristics of that Church, this it is which most justly renders its members the objects of jealousy and suspi-

* In his address to the Council he spoke once and calmly of the safe-conduct of Sigismund, which had tempted him to Constance, and a blush was raised on the cheek of his despicable betrayer, a blush which, recorded in history, was cited even by Charles V. when solicited to practise a similar treachery towards the Reformers of his day. Hus, when his sentence had been pronounced, prayed for the pardon of his enemies, who laughed at him for this act of charity.

cion to a nation of Protestants. Even the claims of their spiritual head to a right of interference, whether direct or indirect, in the temporal concerns of states, (if they were universally acknowledged,) would be of far less practical moment, than the doctrine which excludes from salvation all those who dare to separate themselves from the Roman Church. For those claims must, of necessity, be limited in their efficacy by so many considerations of expedience, they would be always so much counteracted by the spirit of national independence, which animates every people once admitted to the enjoyment, or even the knowledge, of freedom, that in any advanced state of civil society, little comparative danger can be apprehended even from the open assertion of them. In truth, in the common passions and feelings of men, in their pride, and in their selfishness, the Church would here find active and powerful opponents; but in those very passions and feelings, when it tells its children that they only are within the pale of Christ's flock, that they only, therefore, are entitled to the salvation which Christ came from Heaven to purchase with his blood, the Church will always have its surest support and most faithful allies. I repeat, therefore, whenever the

number of the followers of that Church is in any degree considerable, much more when, in a great integral member of an empire, they form, as in Ireland, a majority of the population, it must remain a question of serious and awful deliberation, whether they can be safely trusted with any large share of political power.

The importance of this consideration is so strongly felt by the more artful of your brethren, that in no subject are they more anxious to silence, if not to satisfy, the objections of their adversaries. Unluckily, however, for them, there is here no room for the exercise of their usual policy; the obnoxious tenet can neither be dissembled nor materially softened. It stands in the very front of their whole system; nay, it makes a part of every other dogma; for all are commended to the acceptance of the faithful, under the awful sanction of an anathema if they be rejected.

With these difficulties, nothing else has remained but boldly to admit the charge, and to recriminate on the accuser. Accordingly Dr. Doyle has not scrupled to pursue this course, under the sanction of an oath before the Committee of the House of Lords.

Q. "Do you know that the doctrine of ex-

“ exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome is
 “ preached in Ireland by your parochial clergy
 “ to their flocks?” A. “ I think it is preached
 “ by the parochial clergy of every church in
 “ Ireland, as well as ours; so that *in that I do*
 “ *not suppose there is any difference between one*
 “ *Church and another.* The doctrine of exclu-
 “ sive salvation is found as expressly stated in
 “ the 18th Article of the Established Church, I
 “ think, as in any of our creeds: besides, that
 “ profession of faith adopts the Athanasian
 “ Creed, which also establishes exclusive sal-
 “ vation; so that I do not know of any church,
 “ the ministers of which do not preach exclu-
 “ sive salvation in one sense or another; for it
 “ is, in my opinion, a doctrine common to every
 “ sect of Christianity.”

Of the accuracy of this statement, as far as
 relates to our eighteenth Article, my readers
 will be able to form a better judgment, after
 reading the Article itself. Its title is as follows,
 and I beg their attention to it:

“ XVIII. *Of Obtaining Salvation only by the name of Christ.*

“ They also are to be had accursed, that pre-
 “ sume to say, that every man shall be saved
 “ *by the law or sect, which he professeth, so*

“ that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For “ Holy Scripture doth set out to us only the “ name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be “ saved.” In other words, those are to be accursed who presume to say, that the great work of redemption by Christ was not necessary for the salvation of man; but that men of any religious persuasion, if they live according to the law or sect which they profess, and to mere natural light, shall be saved *thereby*: whereas, Holy Scripture tells us, “ that all who shall be saved, of whatever sect or persuasion they may be, will be saved only by the name of Jesus Christ—only by reason of Him and His merits.” That this is, in one sense, a doctrine of exclusive salvation, I am quite ready to admit: but let us see of what it is exclusive—it is not of the subjects of salvation, for it absolutely excludes none,—but only of means, or authors, of salvation. In short, it does no more nor less, than *exclude all other Saviours than our Lord Jesus Christ*. Here then the whole parallel between the churches of Rome and England, in respect to the dogma of exclusive salvation, as far as our Article is concerned, falls absolutely to nothing.*

* In another work of his (Defence by I. K. L. p. 71) Dr.

Of the Athanasian Creed, so far as the adoption of it exposes our Church to the reproach of being uncharitable, I do not think it necessary to repeat here what I have already said in my Letter to Earl Grey (p. 368). But in answer to the allegation of it by Dr. Doyle, I must remark, that it would, indeed, be a good argumentum ad homines if we condemned the Roman Catholic Church simply for holding, that the belief of *some* articles of faith is necessary to salvation. But this, Dr. Doyle knows perfectly well, is not the case; he knows, that humbly acknowledging our Lord's own words, "He that believeth not shall be damned," we do also acknowledge and profess, that there are some truths made known in the Gospel, which must be believed by all who hope to share in the salvation of the Gospel. The Divinity of God the Son, and of God the Holy Ghost, the distinction of each from the other and from the Almighty Father, and at the same time the

Doyle has improved his chance of convicting us of symbolizing with his Church in this particular, by a very ingenious expedient. He has amended our Article by substituting *in* for *by*, and thus makes it hold them accursed, who presume to say that every man shall be saved *in* the law or sect which he professeth, so that he live according to it,—a proposition which our church has not either denied or affirmed, leaving its members to their full liberty in this particular.

Unity of their Godhead,—the Incarnation of God the Son in the man Christ Jesus,—the Atonement made by Him for the Sins of the World,—the Resurrection of the body,—the future judgment,—and everlasting life; these are the points of faith pronounced by the Church of England, in the Athanasian Creed, to be necessary to be believed; and of none others does that Church anywhere make such declaration. In short, we think that there is a distinction between articles fundamental and not fundamental, and we pronounce no judgment of those who hold, or hold not, the latter.

This would be our answer, if the point in question were, whether we are justly chargeable with want of charity towards those who differ from us. But this is really a matter quite foreign from the present inquiry. The point to be settled is, not whether we are uncharitable, nor, indeed, whether Roman Catholics are;—but rather, laying, for the present, all consideration of their charity aside, whether they hold any opinions respecting the spiritual state, the religious hope, of Protestants of the Church of England, which disqualifies them from being entrusted with the power of legislating for that church, and for the constitution of which it is an integral part. It is, therefore, perfectly idle,

to tell us, as we are sometimes told by men of high authority, that if they think us heretics, and on that account out of the way of salvation, we think them idolaters, and therefore in the way of damnation. For, in the first place, we do not think them idolaters formally, though we do think they commit an act which is idolatrous materially; and for material idolatry (as contradistinguished from formal) no member of the Church of England would pronounce so harshly of any professing Christian. But, secondly, even if we did hold that opinion in its fullest extent, it would only show that we should be unfit to be admitted to any effective share in the government of a country where the Roman Catholic religion is the established religion, and, as such, most intimately united to the state. This, however, I repeat, is not the question: we are not seeking to ascertain whether we Protestants are fit to be entrusted with the government of a Roman Catholic state; but whether Roman Catholics are fit to bear part in this Protestant government: and in order to settle this point, it is only necessary to see what they think of us and our religion.

I hardly need to remind any one, that the Church of Rome being the mother and mistress of all churches, they, who are not in commu-

nion with her, are regarded not as aliens merely, but as rebels* and renegades; that herein she differs from all other churches, who look on those who are excluded from their communion, as sinners it may be, but as left to the judgment of God, with which judgment man has no right to interfere. To their own master they stand or fall. But the Church of Rome claims a right of jurisdiction even over those who have left her bosom, or have been excluded from it: according to her own most formal instructions given for the guidance of her own clergy, "it is not to be denied that they are still in the power of the Church, to be called to judgment by her, to be punished, and condemned with an anathema."†

We are told, indeed, that, as becomes a tender mother, and a most merciful mistress, she mourns over the wretchedness of these undutiful children and subjects, whom she is forced to punish. Nay, we are assured, on the oath of Dr. Murray,‡ that even when recourse is had to the severest censures, "when a decayed member is cut off from the body, it is with a view to his amendment." In order to prove how

* Delahogue de Eccles. p. 246.

† Cat. ad Par. pars I. c. 13.

‡ Lords, p. 267.

diligently and how tenderly this amendment is sought, I will beg leave to present my readers with a copy of the conclusion of an "anathema," as it is given in the Pontificale: "Whereas N.,
" at the instigation of the Devil," and so forth,
" therefore *by the judgment of God the Father*
" *Almighty, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, and of
" St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and of all
" the Saints: moreover, by authority of our
" mediocrity, and by the power of binding and
" loosing in Heaven and in Earth conferred by
" God upon us, we separate him from the recep-
" tion of the precious body and blood of the
" Lord, and from the society of all Christians,
" and *exclude him from the thresholds of holy*
" *mother Church in Heaven and in Earth*, and
" we decree him to be excommunicated and
" anathematized, *and adjudge him to be damned*
" *with the Devil and his angels, and all reprobates,*
" *to eternal fire*; until he recover from the snares
" of the Devil, and return to amendment, and
" repentance, and satisfy the Church which he
" has injured; delivering him to Satan for the
" destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may
" be saved in the day of judgment." This is
among the punishments which the Church of
Rome claims the right of inflicting on those bap-
tized Christians, who are not of her communion:

and, in further illustration of her sentiments on this important subject, I will subjoin an extract from her “order for reconciling an apostate, “schismatic, or heretic,” which shews most plainly and avowedly the view she takes of the condition of us, and of all who presume to differ from her—that we are under the immediate influence of the devil. After the party has professed his belief in each article of the Apostles’ creed, kneeling on his knees, the Pontiff, wearing his mitre, rises from his seat, and says over him, still kneeling, what follows—“I exorcise thee, O unclean spirit, by God the Father Almighty, and by Jesus Christ his Son, “and by the Holy Ghost, that thou depart “from this servant of God, whom God and our “Lord vouchsafes to rescue from thy errors and “deceits, and to recall to the Holy Mother, the “Catholic and Apostolic Church.”

Such then is the light in which schismatics and heretics are regarded by this most merciful and charitable Church. But that all members of the Church of England and Ireland are accounted by her both as schismatics and heretics, I need not add: it follows, therefore, with all the strictness of a syllogism, that, by belonging to this our Church, we are, in the opinion of the Church of Rome, not only cut off from all communion with the true Church of Christ, but

are also cast off by God, and abandoned to the guidance of the devil in this world, and to a fellowship in his punishment in the world to come! Yet they who thus think of our Church, claim (*that is the word, be it remembered*) *claim, as a civil right*, to legislate for her.—Whatever may be thought of the charity of these religionists, it is at least equal to their modesty.

After this, it cannot be necessary to dwell on the notorious fact, that the Church of Rome requires it to be believed, as an article of faith, that salvation cannot be had by any who are without its pale. It is more important to remark, that all are without its pale who presume to exercise the reason with which God has gifted them, and for the due use of which, as of every other talent entrusted to us by the same Almighty Being, if there be truth in his revealed word, we shall hereafter be called into judgment. All, I say, are ipso facto without the pale of the Church of Rome, if they knowingly exercise their reason in opposition to her decree on the smallest point that can be named.

In a tract of Bossuet's, entitled "Catholicity and Christianity inseparable," recently published in this country in the same volume with his "Exposition of Doctrine," we read the fol-

lowing explanation of the terms Catholic and Heretic. “ *The Heretic is he who has an opinion,* “ for such is the meaning of that word. But “ what are we to understand by having an opinion? It is the following of our own fancy “ and particular sentiment. But *the Catholic is* “ —Catholic; that is universal, who, *without* “ *maintaining any particular sentiment, hesitates* “ *not to follow the doctrine of the Church.*”—p. 171. Hence it appears, that the liberty of these self-called Catholics is on a par with their charity and their modesty—and if there be any truth, as, in spite of Johnson’s well known ridicule, there is much truth, in the hackneyed verse,

“ Who rules o’er freemen must himself be free,”

how admirably qualified would they be to rule over the free Church of England and Ireland!

I have said, that all are out of the pale of the Church of Rome, who differ from her in any single point declared by her to be of faith. This will not, cannot, be denied. Every single point of faith must be believed under pain of damnation. Fundamental and not fundamental is a distinction, which not only Bossuet, but Dr. Doyle, scorns and ridicules. “ The unity “ of faith,” says the latter, “ does not admit of

“ more or less :” * in other words, it is no less a sin against divine faith, it no less excludes from all hope of salvation, to say, in at least apparent conformity to the Second Commandment, “ that no religious worship is due to an image of the Virgin Mary,” than to “ deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,” a denial, of which St. John expressly tells us that it is the spirit of Antichrist.

But they more especially are shut out of the pale of Christ’s fold, and cut off from the common hope of Christians, who deny the *power* of the Church of Rome thus to pronounce definitively and infallibly in every matter of religious belief. As Dr. Doyle himself says, in an address to the “ Clergy of Carlow,” &c. 28th of August, 1825—“ it is *the worst of Heresy*, and a virtual apostacy from the Christian religion to assert that the gates of Hell have ever prevailed against this Church”—“ that is, that *the pastors and people* who compose it, *have ever, at any period, even for a single hour, professed error :*”—a sentence, by which every national church, every denomination of Christians throughout the world, which differs from Rome in the minutest point of faith, is

* Essay, p. 259.

pronounced to be in a state of the most damnable heresy.

It is true, that in the course of the examination, particularly before the Committee of the House of Commons, there are various attempts made to dilute and soften this monstrous dogma. Among other things it is said by Dr. Murray (p. 228.) "it is only *contumacious* error "in faith, and an *obstinate* denial of an article of "the Catholic faith, which is called Heresy"—again, "with respect to Protestants," says he, "we do not hold that all who are not united "externally to the Catholic Church are to be "lost; we even hope that *many who are attached to other bodies of Christians may (not having "sufficient opportunity of becoming acquainted with "the true faith) be treated with mercy before the "Supreme Judge.*" "All Protestants who are "baptized become, by the very act of this "baptism, members of the Church of Christ, "children of God, and heirs of everlasting life." "A person baptized, growing up in ignorance of "what we consider the true faith, and without the "means of arriving at it, if he do not commit any "other grievous sins to exclude him from Heaven, "will reach the glory of God's kingdom with as "much certainty as any one externally united to "our body." This is the language of Dr. Murray;

and that of Dr. Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, is similar. "To constitute a heretic, contumacy in error with respect to matters of faith is necessary." But when this last mentioned prelate is required to explain what he means by contumacy (p. 243.) he honestly says, "those who, after having had a full opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of the truths which I consider necessary to salvation, and of having their error removed, if they still persist, I do consider such error on their part to be voluntary, and that they therefore become contumacious"—a sentence by which, I apprehend, that all persons at least in all the educated classes of life in this country are required to be Roman Catholics, under the penalty of eternal perdition.

But Dr. Doyle's language in a work written in a very different tone from that of his examination before the Committee, goes still further. After saying that "a man might err with regard to any truth of religion; but he would not on that account be an heretic:" he immediately subjoins the following important intimation of his opinion respecting British Protestants—"I do not mean to say, whether whosoever in *this country* leans upon invincible ignorance may not lean upon a broken reed"! (Letters

of I. K. L p. 200.) And again, much more plainly, in a letter addressed by him as bishop to certain of his Clergy, forbidding them to renew their disputes with members of the Bible Society—"They profess to be seeking for truth—" this can only be found in the Catholic Church"—"to ascertain the existence of this Church—" for the infidel, signs and tongues may be necessary; for a Christian, the grace of his baptism, and the creed which he has learned at his mother's breast, is quite sufficient; and to such at least as are born and educated in these countries, it must be quite obvious, if they be humble, pious, dispassionate, and not maddened with enthusiasm, that no sect or denomination of Christians existing in it (the Catholics alone excepted) have not separated themselves from the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church at a certain time, and for causes but too well ascertained; and as to the consequences of such a separation, it is not for me, whilst addressing you, to state them, or to give expression to that deep affliction which the consideration of them excites within us."

Now the plain meaning of all this is, that the great mass of Protestants in England and Ireland are, because they are Protestants, in a

state of perdition ; that not only our Church is an heretical church, but that being such, those who belong to it, cannot, generally speaking, be esteemed other than heretics, and of course under the eternal condemnation annexed to heresy.

In accordance with this is the sworn statement of Mr. Bennett (a dispassionate and judicious observer, and a friend be it remembered to the claims of the Roman Catholics) that “the impression which most of the sermons and exhortations of the priests (in Ireland) are calculated to produce is, that there is no salvation out of their own church ; that he has himself heard them preach the doctrine of exclusive salvation, and that *the general effect upon their minds, when they come to the question is, that their Protestant neighbour is in a state of perdition.*”—(Lords, p. 193, 194.)

Nay, even their catechisms, especially Butler's, which is revised and recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, as a general catechism for the kingdom, *distinguishes* the sin of not endeavouring to know what God has taught from that of *not believing* what God has taught; and distinctly calls those who are guilty of the latter, heretics or infidels—“Who are they, who do not endeavour to “know what God has taught?” “They who neg-

“lect to learn the Christian doctrine.” “Who are they who do not believe what God has taught?” “Heretics and infidels.” Here we see is no allowance for invincible ignorance or involuntary error. In another part of the same catechism it is distinctly said, that none can be saved out of the true Church, and that the true Church is the Roman Church, of which the Pope, who is Christ’s Vicar on earth, is the supreme visible head.

As to the plausible statement, that all baptized persons, being as such members of the Church, if they fall not from it by voluntary error in matters of faith, still continue members whatever be their errors—it is enough to say that even this cannot give to Protestants any hopes of salvation under the terms of the creed of Pius IV. to which every beneficed minister subscribes upon his oath: the phrase there used is, “this true Catholic *Faith*, out of which there is no salvation.”

But even if this were otherwise, and if “involuntary” or “invincible ignorance” could be pleaded for every Protestant in the land, let us see how far the concession would really carry us. It is to be remembered then, that, although baptism entirely removes the guilt of original sin, and also of all actual sins committed

182 PROTESTANTS HAVE NO MEANS OF PARDON.

before baptism, yet every mortal sin committed after baptism can be remitted (according to the Church of Rome) only in the Sacrament of Penance—that no degree of contrition, without that sacrament, either actually received, or intended, can wash away the guilt of such sin: it must also be remembered, that mortal sin, according to that Church, is most easily incurred—that no man, indeed, without extraordinary degrees of grace, can avoid incurring it—and yet, when incurred, it consigns the soul to eternal perdition, unless removed by the Sacrament of Penance, which sacrament, I repeat, can be had only in the Church of Rome.

Even Dr. Murray intimates as much, though in covert terms, in the words which I before cited from his evidence before the Commons, page 229. “ A person baptized, growing up in “ ignorance of what we consider the true faith; “ and without the means of arriving at it, *if he* “ *do not commit any other grievous sin to exclude* “ *him from heaven*, will reach the glory of God’s “ kingdom,” &c.; and again, with regard to baptized Protestants, “ nothing can deprive them “ of the title received by baptism to the inheritance of Heaven, but *some actual sin*, whether “ that sin be the sin of refusing, through their “ own fault, to accept the faith that God has

“revealed, or *any other actual sin.*”—Dr. Doyle has stated that “he includes as belonging to this Church, not only children, idiots, and madmen, but all those who, not having themselves adopted error, but imbibed it from their ancestors—seek earnestly to discover truth, and are ready, on finding it, to stand corrected. All such, if baptized, belong unquestionably to the Church, though, in external communion, they are without her pale, and *their errors are not, in our opinion, so great an obstacle to their salvation, as the want of Sacraments and other aids of which by their situation they are deprived.*”*

Here, then, is the amount of the utmost concession, which can be made even to those whose involuntary error, and invincible ignorance, keep them out of the pale of the Church of Rome. They will be saved—if they do not commit any actual sin. But if they sin, for *them* there is no remission—the blood of Christ has been shed in vain—the gospel of Christ has been preached in vain—If they sin, they have no share in the common blessing promised to Christian sinners—If they sin, they have *not* “an advocate with the Father”—“Jesus Christ

* Defence by I. K. L. page 67.

“ the righteous is *not* the propitiation for *their* “ sins.” They have fallen from grace given in baptism, and to them no “ place of repentance” is left, though they seek it with tears of anguish and “ groans which cannot be uttered :” “ their “ broken and contrite hearts”—the Church of Rome hath said, (and who shall dare to gainsay it?)—“ their broken and contrite hearts, O Lord; “ thou *shalt* despise.”

Sir, when I think of these things, and turn to the laborious trifling* of the Committee, before whom such miserable, such transparent sophistry was played off, seemingly with success—when I hear, even in the House of Commons, all distinction between the Churches of Rome and England, in the most vital article of all, Christian charity—absolutely surrendered—surrendered even by him, whose triumphant efforts in a good cause we have so often hailed with gratitude and delight—I cannot but deplore the

* If it were not recorded in their Report, page 244, it would not be believed, that one of these volunteer Theologues was pleased to propound the following question : “ What is the “ distinction, which you take, between schism and heresy? is “ it, that *the one is voluntary, and the other involuntary?*” The Report does not state, whether the witness had sufficient command of his muscles to answer the question with all the gravity which the interest of his cause required.

lamentable state of religious knowledge in that class, where, above all, it is most important to the common good of all. For to them, as one of the branches of the British legislature, is entrusted, by the constitution of this land, the guardianship of their religion,—the religion of us, of our fathers, of our children, and, I trust in God's mercy, of our children's children. They are to legislate for the Church of England; they are to preserve that most sacred of all the interests committed to their charge; and, if they abandon it—whether by treachery—(but treachery will never be found in many among them)—or by negligence, or by ignorance, or by that greatest curse, which has fallen upon our times, a misnamed spurious liberality—in vain will all their other merits plead for them at the impartial bar of an enlightened posterity. History will stamp her avenging brand upon their names, and most deeply, and most indelibly, on the most illustrious name among them.

But they will not abandon it. Thank God, the people, whom they represent, and who long watched in silence, but not in unreflecting silence, the progress of their delusion, that people is not yet fully imbued with the fashionable folly of the day. It has raised its voice, not in

the senseless clamours of a mob, but in the firm and dignified tone of genuine British feeling. To be told, that Rome and England are on a par in respect to religious tolerance, or intolerance—to hear an argument for the surrender of our fundamental laws founded on such an assertion—was an insult to that feeling, an outrage on truth and common sense, too gross for Englishmen to brook. They have spoken out. They have declared their sober, their deliberate judgment; and never yet has the British House of Commons heard that judgment without respect and reverence.

But I return to the task before me—to trace some of the practical forms in which the hateful and overbearing spirit of Rome delights to display its triumph over the common feelings of our nature. It begins even with the babyhood of its miserable thralls. With a refinement of jealous tyranny, which would be ludicrous, if it were not revolting, it proclaims in the rubric to its office of Baptism, that “*parents and others are to be admonished not to trust their children to be in any wise suckled or nursed by heretic women.*”^{*} It prosecutes its wretched malice even beyond the limits of mortal existence. It

* Ritual. Rom. p. 24.

not only refuses the obsequies of the Church to those whom it calls heretics, (a refusal to which no reasonable objection could be made,) but it denies them also such "maimed rites" as the piety and affection of surviving friends might contrive to render to them in a land of strangers.

In many countries, no funeral of a Protestant can take place except in the loneliest hours of night, or morning twilight; no protection given to the place of sepulture; but the human corse, which has been the temple of the Holy Ghost, while living, and will be, as Christian charity bids us hope, hereafter "raised again in glory"—is interred in some open field like a dead dog.* Nor are these things the unauthorized acts of a local priesthood, or concessions to the prejudice of a bigoted populace: no, they have their prototypes and sanction in the decree of at least one General Council. That of Constance, in its eighth session, solemnly commanded that the

* I wish not to disparage the permission, recently, and after much negotiation, given by the present Pope to the Protestants at Rome to inclose their burial-ground. I will only say, that those who best know all the circumstances attending this affair, will be least inclined to vaunt its liberality. But does not the necessity of negotiation on such a subject, and still more the notorious difficulties in bringing it to a tolerable conclusion, prove all that is necessary?

bones of our countryman Wicliff, whom, when dead, they were pleased to sentence as a heretic, should be dug from the earth in which they lay, and cast out as vile.* The prohibition of the interment of heretics in consecrated ground is expressly enjoined in the bull of Martin V. "Inter cunctas,"† a bull, which gave the papal sanction to such portions of the Council's proceedings, as are recognised as valid, and among them to its decrees against heretics. Yet, knowing all this, Dr. Doyle has the confidence to speak of the law, which permits Roman-Catholics in Ireland publicly to use their own rites in burying in our churchyards, (on observing the lightest condition that could be devised, consistently with the existence of our own establishment)—Dr. Doyle has the confidence, I say, to speak of this law, as "a charter of toleration for their dead, founded on the degradation of the living." "The Catholics," says he, "like one man, despised this bill— their priests and prelates universally would rather be condemned to labour at some treadmill, than seek a license for interment, a permit that the remains of one of their communion

* Labb. Con. t. xvi. p. 119.

† Ibid. p. 754. Dr. Doyle himself cites this bull as of unquestioned authority. "Essay," p. 131,

“ should be gathered to those of his fathers, in
“ the vault or ground which his own religion
“ had inclosed and consecrated.”* Really,
these persons are so cockered and spoiled by
the flattery of our liberal politicians, that they
have not even the decent discretion to soften
their most unreasonable pretensions.

But I return to the practice of their own
Church. The same odious spirit, which makes
it a subject of grave precaution, that heresy
be not sucked in with the nurse's milk, and
which violates the decencies of our common
nature in refusing the protection even of a secure
grave to the bones of a deceased Protestant,
has intruded itself into the dearest connections
of domestic life, and sought to make the mar-
riage-bed a scene of discord and polemic alter-
cation. Had the Church of Rome been content
to dissuade its followers from marrying with
persons of a different communion, it would have
deserved no censure—but it disdains so tame a
course. Bull following upon Bull, and in par-
ticular a papal rescript which is now before me,
after “ most deeply lamenting that there are
“ Catholics who are *so maddened by an insane*
“ *love, as not to flee with horror from these detest-*

* Letters of I. K. L. p. 62. 31.

“ *able nuptials* which the Holy Mother, the
 “ Church, has always condemned and inter-
 “ dicted,” proceeds to give high praise to “ the
 “ zeal of those priests who strive, by more than
 “ ordinary severity of spiritual punishment, to
 “ coerce and restrain all Catholics from uniting
 “ themselves in this sacrilegious bond with
 “ heretics;” and “ all faithful ministers of God
 “ and the Church are strictly enjoined to deter,
 “ to the utmost of their power, their people of
 “ both sexes from engaging in these marriages,
 “ *to the ruin of their souls;*” nay, “ they are to
 “ make it their business” (of course in the con-
 “ fessional) “ to interrupt and effectually prevent
 “ them. But if (which God forbid!) it should
 “ happen that such a marriage shall be con-
 “ tracted, every Catholic spouse (whether hus-
 “ band or wife) must take most seriously to
 “ heart the duty of doing penance for the *very*
 “ *heinous wickedness* thereby committed; must
 “ pray to God for pardon, and *must strive to the*
 “ *utmost to draw into the bosom of the Church his,*
 “ *or her partner,* (now wandering from the true
 “ faith,) and so to gain a soul, *the most appro-*
 “ *priate of all methods to obtain pardon for the*
 “ *crime committed.*”

Now, by whom was this monstrous order
 framed? *By the present Pope.*—When did it

issue? *In the spring of last year.* It was set forth in the spring of 1825, while the Committee of the House of Commons was fondly catching the honeyed dew of peace and brotherly love, as it trickled from the guileless lips of Drs. Doyle, Murray, Kelly, and Magaurin:—nay, it was, for aught I know, at the very moment when a great British statesman was announcing to parliament, his glad conviction, that the Church of Rome had laid aside all her ancient bigotry and intolerance, was become as placid and as amiable as heart could wish; was, in short, no more uncharitable in its judgment of the people of other communions, than we ourselves.—But, above all, *to whom* was this rescript directed? was it to the Pope's own temporal subjects? or to his countrymen in Italy? was it to Spaniards, Austrians, Frenchmen? was it to the members of any state which owns his authority?—To none of these.—To whom, then, has he dared to address this shameless avowal of his arrogance, no less than of his bigotry?—To subjects of this realm—to the inhabitants of “the Islands in North America belonging to “Great Britain”—TO ENGLISHMEN like ourselves.

Shall I say more of the spirit of the Church of Rome? of its unaltered, its unalterable, its

inherent, its essential hostility to all that dare to be independent of its will? Shall I stop to ask whether the adherents of that Church, honourable and high-minded, as many of them may be, (and no men of any communion are more honourable or more high-minded, than the Roman-Catholic gentry of this land,) are fit to be entrusted with the power of legislating for a nation and for a Church of Protestants? for men, to whom the rights of conscience are dearer even than those civil liberties, which they would yet rather die a thousand deaths than suffer to be wrested from them?

Let us be no longer told, that the Roman-Catholic gentry partake not of the rancorous feelings of their spiritual rulers;—that they hold not the tenets which sanction them—that those tenets are no essential part of their religion. When they speak thus, we believe that they speak sincerely. But then they must be plainly told, that they are dupes;—they are dupes of that treacherous policy, which has distinguished the heads of their Church from the moment when it first conceived a hope of lording over the household of faith, and has never since been abandoned.

If those tenets be not essential, let the authority, be it what it may, which can declare what

is, or is not essential, renounce and disclaim them. If this be not done, no adequate security can be given to any free Protestant state against the arrogant pretensions, the rancorous malignity, of their Church itself. If this be not done, let those among them (and there are many such) who cherish the feelings of Christian charity, and respect the rights of other Christians, either emancipate themselves from the bonds of religious tyranny, or candidly acknowledge that it is not the Crown, it is not the Heir to the Crown, it is not the House of Lords, it is not the people of England—it is the Pope, it is the Church of Rome itself, which bars the entrance of the British senate, and condemns them to a state of mortifying but necessary exclusion.

The reason of this exclusion will last as long as this hateful spirit of intolerance in your Church shall last. Whether the Pope's claim to power in temporals be granted or denied; whether infallibility be ascribed to him, or not; whether none or all of the Gallican liberties be asserted in Ireland, are questions of comparatively little moment. In truth, we find in history, that those who have been most strenuous in resisting the lofty pretensions of the Vatican have often been distinguished by the utmost excess of intolerance in their own principles

and conduct. The Council of Constance, we have seen, while it laboured to impose limits on the exorbitant power of the Pope, murdered Hus and Jerome, dug up the bones of Wicliff, and enacted canons against heretics, scarcely less ferocious than those of Lateran. The author, or, at least, the consolidator of the Gallican liberties, Bossuet himself, was the chief of persecutors; he was a persecutor on principle, and has recorded his principle as the unquestioned and unquestionable dogma of his Church. "The Church of Rome," says he, "is the most intolerant of all Christian sects; it is *her holy and inflexible incompatibility*"—(never was a word better chosen or more happily applied)—"it is her holy and inflexible incompatibility, which renders her severe, unconciliating, and odious to all sects separated from her; they desire only to be tolerated by her; but her holy severity forbids such indulgence." He has said also, "*The exercise of the power of the sword, in matters of religion and conscience, is a point not to be called in question; there is no illusion more dangerous, than to make toleration a characteristic of the true Church.*"*

But all this Dr. Murray resolves into meta-

* Cited in the Committee of Lords, p. 267.

phor and figure of speech. Aye, it was in a metaphor, that this very Bossuet counselled Louis XIV. to revoke the edict of Nantes. It was merely a stroke of pious rhetoric, to call on the assembled Peers and nobles of the land, in God's own house, to "raise their acclamations even to the vault of Heaven, and thus to address their new Charlemagne, 'you have given stability to the true faith, *you have exterminated the heretics*; this is the work worthy of your reign, this is the glorious distinction by which it will be known in history.*" All this, no doubt, was rhetoric, and it was no fault of Bossuet's, if the matter-of-fact monarch took him at his word, and compelled many hundred thousands of his most industrious, most loyal, most conscientious subjects, to fly from the very soil of France, and seek for shelter in some foreign land, where

* Oraison Funèbre de M. le Chancelier, p. 269. Bossuet there tells his hearers, that the dying Chancellor in fixing the seal to the Edict of Revocation, said that "after this triumph of the faith, and so grand a monument of the piety of the king, he had no longer any care but to close his days."

For reference to this passage I am indebted to the speech of Lord Colchester on the memorable 17th of May, 1825; a speech, of which I may be permitted to say, that it is not less distinguished by its luminous and powerful argument, than by the rich store of valuable information which it contains.

figures of speech are less potential, and metaphors do no murder.

But Ireland, too, is a land of metaphors. "Rhetorical artifices" are as common there as they have ever been elsewhere; and the practical figures of speech which its history records, might rival the choicest effusion from the school of Loyola or Bossuet. The following is an instance from the Memoirs of Lord Orrery:—

"The Irish (Roman Catholics) had presented to his Majesty (King Charles II. after his restoration) a petition, wherein they remonstrated their great oppression, and their *loyalty in the wars*, begging to be restored to their estates and liberties, unjustly taken away from them. The English (in Ireland) had early notice of this petition, and solicited that there might be a fair hearing allowed at the Council Board in England, by deputies on both sides; which reasonable request was soon granted, and the day of hearing appointed;" which being come, his Majesty was pleased to afford his presence, and with him the Duke of Ormond, Lord Chancellor, and several others of great quality." "Lord Orrery produced a paper, and desired it might be shewn to Plunket and the other Irish commissioners, to know, whether they would own *the names there subscribed to be their hands*. Plunket and the rest seeing the paper, acknowledged they were their hands. Then my Lord desired the paper might be read, which accordingly was done; and it appeared to be an order, or declaration, made at the Irish Supreme Council, wherein they declared unanimously to *prosecute the Lord of Ormond, their Lord Lieutenant, and his party, with fire and sword*." "Then his Lordship delivered another paper to his Majesty,

“ desiring the gentlemen of the Irish commission to declare
 “ whether the names there subscribed, also were not theirs ?
 “ They seeing it, could not deny it was their hand. Lord Or-
 “ rery desired it might be read ; and the paper appeared to be
 “ instructions to Sir Nicholas Plunket and one more” (*the Ro-
 man Bishop of Ferns*). “ to go to the Pope, and in their names
 “ (calling themselves the Supreme Council of Ireland) to offer
 “ that kingdom to his Holiness ; and if he refused, then to offer it
 “ to the King of Spain ; if he refused it, to the King of France ;
 “ if he refused it, to the Duke of Lorraine ; and if he refused it,
 “ then to any other Catholic Prince.”—p. 32—34.

Such was at that time the meaning of the highly figurative phrase, Irish “loyalty in the wars,” rendered into plain English.

My next extract shall be from the preamble of the 9th William III. c. 1.* a prince and a period, to which some authority was wont to be ascribed. It commences thus: “Whereas it is
 “ notoriously known that *all the late rebellions*
 “ *have been contrived, promoted, and carried on by*
 “ *Popish Archbishops, Bishops, Jesuits, and other*
 “ *ecclesiastical persons of the Romish Clergy.*”

In the journals of the Irish House of Commons, A.D. 1733 (p. 47.)† it is recorded, that from a deposition on oath, made before a Committee of that House, and corroborated by collateral evidence, it appears, that “the Pope (Benedict

* Irish Statutes.

† Cited in Commons, p. 542, and Appendix, 850.

“ XIII.) had complied with the *requests of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland*, and that his Holiness had sent an Indulgence for ten years, in order to raise a sum of money to be speedily applied to restore King James the Third to his right, and put his present Majesty (George II.) and all the royal family to the sword.”

By the sworn evidence of Dr. James Macnevin before the Committee of Irish House of Lords, in 1798, it is stated to have been part of the instructions from the Executive Directory of the Irish Union to their accredited agent with the French Directory—“ That *the Catholic Priests* had ceased to be alarmed at the calumnies which had been propagated of French irreligion, and *were well affected to the cause: that some of them had rendered great service* in propagating *with discreet zeal* the system of the Irish Union.”* There was also respectable sworn testimony that “ *Dr. Caulfield, Romish Bishop of Ferns, blessed the pikemen, as they were proceeding to massacre the Protestants on the bridge of Wexford.*” One Dease, a Popish priest, who was taken with French arms in his possession, declared upon

* Journals of Irish House of Lords, A.D. 1798. p. 155.

vath, that some time before the French landed, the Roman-Catholic "*bishop of Killala, Dr. Bellew, ordered his clergy, at a general meeting to join and assist them.*"*

These various statements will help us to understand the bold figure of speech, employed in the following passage of an address to his present Majesty, when Prince Regent—"No portion of his Majesty's subjects is, or *has at any time been, more eminently distinguished for pure, conscientious, and disinterested loyalty, than the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland.*"†

But it is time to notice a few of Dr. Doyle's similar figures; they certainly are not among the least curious, which the records of Irish affairs supply. "I never," says he to the Committee of the House of Commons, (p. 210.) "*I never spoke without sincerity;*" and in his recent *Essay on Catholic Claims* (p. 103.) we read as follows—"a desire to equivocate or obscure the truth, by casuistry, could never find a place in my mind." Now let me illustrate these sayings of his by one or two instances.

* Musgrave, Hist. ii. p. 482. 171.

† I cite this and two or three preceding instances from the appendix to a valuable pamphlet, entitled "*Dangers with which England and Ireland are now menaced,*" &c.—Rivingtons, 1817.

1. It will be recollected that the prophecies of Pastorini had ventured to fix the downfall of the Protestant cause, and the destruction of the Protestant princes and people, for the year 1825. These prophecies, it was known, had been circulated in *some* degree, and were supposed to have produced some effect, whether more or less, on the easily excited minds of the Irish populace: and the Committee of the House of Lords availed themselves of the examination of Dr. Doyle to endeavour to ascertain the extent of the mischief thus produced. Accordingly, they ask Dr. Doyle “whether they “have been circulated extensively, on a separate sheet, among the peasantry of Ireland?” His answer is as follows: “*I do not know*; the “book is a large one; *that there may have been* “an extract of that kind printed and circulated “among the peasantry, I have little doubt; at “the same time I am very confident, that, *if* “*done, it has been done lately, by persons in the* “*South,** to excite dissention in Ireland, and to “*produce appearances of disturbance.*”† He afterwards tells their lordships, that “he has himself “discountenanced the publication, and endea-

* And therefore at a great distance from Dr. Doyle's own diocese, which is not in the South.

† Lords, 247.

“voured successfully to prevent altogether the reading of it; in fine, that he is persuaded *“there is no one in his diocese, who gives the least countenance to it.”* Mr. O’Connell’s account (p. 167.) is still more satisfactory: he “thinks that *no effect* has been produced upon the lower orders of the Irish Catholics by what are called Pastorini’s Prophecies.”

Now, after the concurrent attestations of two such respectable witnesses, speaking, be it remembered, on their oath, could scepticism itself any longer suggest a doubt, whether the prophecies of Pastorini have not been utterly disregarded?

Thus the affair stood: when two months afterwards it was deemed expedient to produce evidence before the Committee of the other House, to prove, not the loyalty of Dr. Doyle, (that, of course, could not be called into question) but the extent of his claim on the gratitude of Government, and of his country, for his laborious and successful exertions in preserving the public peace. I need not remind you, Sir, who are a lawyer, how often the most promising cause has been lost by proving too much! This has, unfortunately, been the case in the present instance. The production of Dr. Doyle’s “Pastoral Letter,” addressed to his diocese in

the commencement of the late disturbances, and dated Nov. 19th, 1822, which letter, we are told, “produced a very powerful and happy “effect on the minds of the people”—the production, I repeat; of this Pastoral, has placed that prelate in the very awkward position, of its being impossible to believe more than half of what he has said on these prophecies; and it has, moreover, left us quite in the dark, as to which half we are to believe, unless common fame, and common sense, shall be thought to have decided against his sworn testimony before the Lords, and in favour of what he delivered to those who must themselves have known, whether his assertions were true or false.

I shall have occasion to recur to this Pastoral Letter again presently; meanwhile I present my readers with the following extracts from it respecting Pastorini’s Prophecies, which I request them to compare with Dr. Doyle’s evidence cited above.

“And what were the motives,” says this prelate to his erring people, “which influenced you to act thus, and even to profane “the awful name of God, and rashly to call Him to attest your “wicked purposes?”* “Your faith in prophecies. This, dearest “brethren, is a subject, which we find it difficult to treat with “becoming seriousness, and yet it is one, which *has produced*

* Commons, p. 667.

“ among you the most deplorable effects. I have been credibly informed, that during the course of the last year, when great numbers of you, yielding to our remonstrance, and those of our clergy, had withdrawn yourselves from those mischievous associations, you were prevailed on to return to them, excited by some absurd stories called ‘ Prophecies,’ and which were disseminated amongst you by designing and wicked men. There have been, to our own knowledge, instances of persons neglecting their domestic concerns, and abandoning their families to misery and want, through a vain hope, grounded on some supposed prophesy, that mighty changes were just approaching. For more than half a century it was predicted, that George the Fourth would not reign; and his very appearance amongst you was scarcely sufficient to dispel the illusion. Such excessive credulity on your parts, and such a superstitious attachment to fables, a thousand times belied, is a melancholy proof of the facility with which you may be seduced by knaves,” &c.

“ But you will tell me, that your prophesy is not of this kind, that it is derived from the sacred Scriptures, as they are explained in the book of Pastorini, called ‘ the History of the Christian Church;’ that book, dearest brethren, has been perverted to very different ends from those which the pious* author intended.” “ Bishop Walmsley, commonly called Pastorini, and the author of your favourite prophesy, wished,” &c.

After this, what shall we say to Dr. Doyle’s attesting upon his oath, that “ he does not know,

* Dr. Doyle told the Lords, and took credit with them accordingly, that in a more recent pastoral he had called this same prophesy, “ the impious production of an over-heated mind;” and he further told them, on his oath, that “ these latter words express what he thinks of it.”—(Lords, p. 247.)

“ *whether these prophecies have been circulated extensively among the peasantry of Ireland—that indeed he has little doubt, that there may have been an extract of that kind printed and circulated—but that at the same time he is very confident, that, if done, it has been done lately, in the South, to produce appearances of disturbance.*”*

2. I proceed to another specimen. It shall be Dr. Doyle’s statement of his opinion of the general benefits which would be produced in Ireland by what is called by the Committee of the Commons “Catholic Emancipation,” by the Lords “the admission of the Catholics to equal rights and privileges.” I will take his answer

* Dr. Doyle in his “Essay,” (p. 197, 198.) ascribes the circulation of the prophecies to Orangemen: he adds, “Major Warburton, who supplied a copy of them to the House of Commons in 1824, admits in his re-examination on the 21st of June, 1825, that these prophecies, though found in abundance even amongst the police, were not circulated by Catholics.” This is like so many other of Dr. Doyle’s assertions: what Major Warburton really said is as follows:—Q. “The reports (of disturbances) to which you have alluded, were reports of the intended rising of the Catholics, encouraged by the prophecies of Pastorini; by whom were such reports circulated?” A. “Upon my word I never could trace by whom.” Q. “Do you apprehend *they* (i. e. the reports) were circulated by the Catholics?” A. “Indeed I do not suppose they were.” It would have been strange if they had been.

before the Lords, because it was given last, and given upon oath, and must therefore be reasonably considered as expressing his genuine and deliberate judgment. It is as follows :—

“ I think that the general benefits produced
“ by it would be incalculable. *I am quite confi-*
“ *dent it would put an end to those religious heats and*
“ *animosities* which now prevail so generally. I
“ am also of opinion *it would tranquillize the public*
“ *mind effectually*, and make us all sit down quietly
“ to promote our local and general interests. I
“ also think,” &c. “ In fact, I think *it would knit*
“ *together, and effectually secure the affections of*
“ *the multitude as well as of individuals*, and make
“ us one people immediately, and I hope in a
“ few years a very happy and prosperous people.
“ *Those are my views, such as I entertain them in*
“ *the presence of God and your Lordships,*” &c.

Considering the main subject which was then occupying the attention of Parliament, and the bill which was already introduced, or was known to be about to be introduced, into the Lower House, nothing could be said by Dr. Doyle more satisfactory, or more striking. The whole weight of his authority, we see, (and his authority had much apparently to recommend it,) is given in favour of the great political measure then in progress. That measure was not

only a good one, in his judgment, but seemingly the very best: it could not fail to attain its object—which object was no less than the immediate and perfect pacification of Ireland.

To such an authority I will not presume to oppose any opinion of my own; but I have an authority of no light weight to place in the contrary scale. In short, to the judgment of Dr. Doyle, on 21st of March, 1825, I have to oppose the judgment of Dr. Doyle on 13th of May, 1824.

That prelate, in a letter of his of the last mentioned date to A. Robertson, Esq. M.P. expresses himself as so much delighted with certain sentiments reported to have been delivered by Mr. Robertson in the House of Commons, *on the motion of Mr. Hume, relative to the Church Establishment in Ireland*, that he could not, though a stranger, forbear addressing him, and communicating his entire accordance of opinion, “that *the best, if not the only, effectual mode of pacifying Ireland*, improving the condition of her people, and consolidating the interests of the empire, would be found in a *union of the Churches which distract and divide us.*”

“The whole frame of society amongst us,” says he, “is disorganized.” “This state of the public mind and feeling is unquestionably

“ produced by the inequality of the laws, and
 “ *still more immediately by the incessant collision*
 “ *and conflict of religious opinions.*”

A highly-coloured and awful picture is then drawn of the dangers and distractions of his unhappy country, one particular of which has such immediate connexion with our present subject, that I must not omit it. “ *The Catholic*
 “ *aristocracy, as they are called, since the penal*
 “ *laws were relaxed, have gradually withdrawn*
 “ *themselves from the people ; they have shewn,*
 “ *on some occasions, an overweening anxiety for*
 “ *emancipation, at the expense of what the priest-*
 “ *hood and the other classes deemed the interests, if*
 “ *not the principles, of their religion ; hence they*
 “ *are looked on with suspicion, and can no longer*
 “ *wield the public mind.*”

“ In such a state of things it behoves Parlia-
 “ ment,” &c. “ and I have little doubt, if your
 “ sentiments were adopted by it, but that
 “ Ireland could be tranquillized, the union of
 “ the countries cemented, peace and prosperity
 “ diffused, and the empire rendered invulnera-
 “ ble.”

“ *These results cannot be attained by Catholic Emancipation*
 “ *alone.*” “ *Catholic Emancipation will not remedy the evils of*
 “ *the Tithe system: it will not allay the fervour of religious*
 “ *zeal—the perpetual clashing of two Churches, one elevated,*

" the other fallen, both high-minded, perhaps intolerant: it
 " will not check the rancorous animosities with which different
 " sects assail each other: it will not remove all suspicion of par-
 " tiality in the government, were Antoninus himself the Vice-
 " roy: it will not create that sympathy between the different
 " orders in the State, which is ever mainly dependent on religion,
 " nor produce that unlimited confidence between man and man,
 " which is the strongest foundation on which public welfare
 " can repose, as well as the most certain pledge of a nation's
 " prosperity. Withal, Catholic Emancipation is a great pub-
 " lic measure, and of itself not only would effect much, but
 " open a passage to ulterior measures, which a provident le-
 " gislature could without difficulty effect. *The union of the*
 " *Churches*, however, which you have had the singular merit of
 " suggesting to the Commons of the United Kingdom, would
 " together and at once effect a total change in the dispositions of
 " men: it would bring all classes to co-operate zealously in
 " promoting the prosperity of Ireland, and in securing her alle-
 " giance for ever to the British Throne. *The question of*
 " *Emancipation* would be swallowed up in the great inquiry, how
 " Ireland could be enriched and strengthened."

3. The proverb intimates, that it is hard to
 decide when doctors disagree; but when one
 Doctor is thus at variance with himself, the dif-
 ficulty is much lighter. In the present case,
 men of plain understanding will reject both Dr.
 Doyle's prescriptions. Will it be said, that one
 of them can be more easily taken than the other?
 —that his last nostrum, Emancipation, is really
 within the competence of parliament to effect;
 whereas the union of churches is what the most

skilful compounder of politics and polemics would attempt in vain? No. The Doctor has an answer ready: "*This Union*, on which so much depends, is not so difficult, as appears to many. *It is not difficult*; for in certain discussions and correspondence, in the last century, it appeared that the points of agreement between the churches are numerous, and the failure was owing more to Princes than to Priests,—more to state-policy than to a difference of belief. But the present time is," he assures us, "peculiarly well calculated for attempting it. For what interest can England *now* have which is opposed to such an Union, and what nation or church in the universe can have stronger motives for desiring it than Great Britain, if by it she could *preserve her Church Establishment*, perfect her internal polity, and secure her external dominion?"

Now, all this is very promising, and the reasons he gives for calling "the time favourable," are the most satisfactory imaginable. I have not room for all of them; but two or three must have a place: "*The Irish Catholics*," he says, "are wearied and fatigued; *exceedingly desirous of repose*; the *Established Religion* is *almost frittered away*;" but lastly, and princi-

pally, he depends on "the improvement of men's minds during the last century, the light and *liberality* which distinguish the present."

These are the facilities which the present time affords for that "Union of the Churches of England and Rome, under which a new æra of happiness would commence in our history."

So glowing a picture who can contemplate without delight? even if it were incapable of being ever completely realized, who would mar it with the rude brush of truth, and tell us that the whole is, and must ever continue to be, mere fiction? No one, certainly, but the ingenious artist himself; and he has not scrupled to laugh outright at all who can be such fools, as to believe a single word of all that he has been saying.

"Do not, my dear brethren,"—it is part of Dr. Doyle's Pastoral Address of 1822,*—"do not, my dear brethren, be so silly as to expect, that even if those, who differ from you in religious belief in this country, were to change their creed, they would embrace yours; far from it; they would, for the greater part, cease to be Christians, or form a religion for themselves; it is not consistent with the nature of man, nor with the ordinary providence of God, that a body of men, like our dissenting brethren, who have been separated from the Church so long, and accustomed each of them to judge for himself, in all matters human and divine, should again subject themselves to the yoke of authority and capti-

* Commons, p. 670.

“vate their understanding to the obedience of faith; individuals might do so; whole classes might do so; but *neither the power of the state, nor the force of law, nor the terror of death; nothing short of miracle, greater than any hitherto recorded, could produce uniformity of religion in England or here.*”

4. My next illustration of Dr. Doyle's figurative mode of speaking shall be found in his answer to the following question from the Committee of the House of Commons.—p. 216.

“Do you hold the same opinion, with respect to the elective franchise, and the effect of attempts to disfranchise the forty shilling freeholders, which are held by the author of the letters of I. K. L.?” A. “Upon that subject, as I happen to be an ecclesiastic, if the Committee would indulge me by permitting me not to express an opinion, they would favour me much. In this place I would wish that any testimony I am called upon to give should not be of a political kind; for *if ever I took a part in political discussions, it was with great reluctance,* and only until the difficulties under which the country laboured enabled me to return to that privacy in which I always wish to live. To give an opinion as to the forty shilling freeholders would be rather a political one, than one connected with religion; therefore if the Committee will indulge me in my own inclination, I should much rather not give an opinion; *merely for this reason, that it is a political question; and that I am an ecclesiastic.*”

That the Committee was pleased to acquiesce in this answer, is only one of the many proofs of their courtesy to this favoured and meritorious witness. I hope it will be deemed no

breach of privilege, if I presume to shew how much their favour was merited by him in this instance.

But, first, I must express my unfeigned admiration of the gravity of himself and his hearers, when he thus proclaimed the great reluctance with which he ever takes a part in political discussions. Why, there is scarcely a person in all Ireland so prominent or notorious on such occasions. It was but a few days before he set sail from that country, to give evidence before the Committee, that he published the last of the Letters of I. K. L. ; and of those Letters there is scarcely a page which does not teem with political matter of the most virulent and inflammatory kind :* and yet after a forbearance,

* Let me give a specimen or two : “ A police bill, and a
 “ tithe-composition bill, and fifty thousand bayonets may
 “ repress disturbances, but who can contemplate a brave and
 “ generous people so abused ? *Who can dwell in a country so*
 “ *accursed ? What man can appear before his God who has looked*
 “ *patiently at such wrong, or who has not contributed by every*
 “ *legal means to relieve his fellow-creatures from sufferings so*
 “ *intense ?*” p. 49. Again : “ Reject them, insult them, con-
 “ tinue to deprive them of hope, and they will league with
 “ Beelzebub against you. Revenge is sweet, and the pride of
 “ a nation is like the vanity of a woman, when wounded it is
 “ relentless. They will repeal the Union. Yes, undoubtedly.
 “ The present generation will not pass, if you continue the old
 “ system, until you will find the cry for emancipation turned

which could hardly have lasted longer than the time it took him to make his passage—after this totum triduum—he has the confidence to tell a Committee of the English House of Commons, that he hates politics, and is the most peaceable man living. Nay, when he ventures to express his wish that any testimony he may be called upon to give in that place “should not be of a “political kind,” both he and they well knew that he had, the very instant before, given them his opinion, at length, on the great political question of Catholic Emancipation.

“into a clamorous demand for that very measure. Irishmen were “before united in seeking to make this country independent; “the embassy to the French Directory consisted not of Catholics but of Irishmen. They may unite again. The mighty “body of Catholics, growing, as it is, in size and strength, “will, like all large bodies, attract smaller ones to it; the fury “of fanaticism may subside, and you will be amazed in a few “years at the coalition of interests in Ireland. If this power “which exists at present, and which will go on increasing, be “left conflicting with the power of the state, *it will compel you “to kiss the feet of France, or wage against her the most dan- “gerous war in which England has ever been engaged.”* p. 285. Once more: “How often have I perceived in a congregation of “some thousand persons, how the very mention, from my own “tongue, of the penal code caused every eye to glisten, and every “ear to stand erect; *the trumpet of the last judgment, if sounded, “would not produce a more perfect stillness in any assemblage of “Irish peasantry, than a strong allusion to the wrongs we suffer.”* p. 287.

But no more of this.—Let us look to the subject of the forty shilling freeholders, and his recorded opinions thereupon. In order that they may be duly appreciated, it is necessary to premise a brief statement of the grounds of the measure itself, which I shall do in the words of a countryman of his own.

“ As soon as the Irish Act of 1793 conferred the elective
 “ franchise on Roman Catholic freeholders of all descriptions,
 “ the nobility and gentry seised of estates, (though a vast
 “ majority of them were Protestants,) yet vyeing with each
 “ other in electioneering interest, and the representation in
 “ Parliament depending on popular elections, began to convert
 “ the chattel interests of their peasantry (Roman Catholic as
 “ as well as Protestant) into freehold. Since that period the
 “ manufacture of freeholders has thriven in so great a degree,
 “ that some counties, which previously did not contain more
 “ than eleven hundred freeholders, have now more than eleven
 “ thousand. The process of the manufacture is as follows :
 “ the nobleman or gentleman seised of an estate, demises it in
 “ parcels to farmers for one life, or more ; the farmer demises
 “ *one acre* of his farm, or *less*, to each of his *labourers* for life.
 “ The labourer erects a wretched habitation (in Ireland called a
 “ cabin) on it, in which he and his poor family reside. This
 “ holding he *registers* as his *freehold*, and *swears* it to be worth
 “ forty shillings a year over and above the rent he is bound to
 “ pay for it. This rent he is obliged to satisfy by working as a
 “ labourer for his lessor. Such is the general description of
 “ forty shilling freeholders in Ireland. Of this class the great
 “ majority are Roman Catholics ; and such freeholders exceed
 “ all other freeholders in the proportion of *five to one*, or in a
 “ *greater* proportion. *Thus the Roman Catholics have now the*

“ return of the majority of the Irish representation in their power.

“ By the grant of the elective franchise to Irish Romanists, and by the reforming spirit of the Union, the greater part of the Irish representation has been transferred from the opulent to the indigent—from those who are attached to the British Constitution by religious principle, to those whose religious principles are opposed to its letter and its spirit : and (considering the overruling power of their religious system amongst the Irish Romanists) THE RETURN OF THE MAJORITY OF THE REPRESENTATION IS NOW IN THE ROMISH HIERARCHY AND CLERGY.”

Such is the present state of the law of election in Ireland.

The legislative measure on which Dr. Doyle's opinion was (as has been seen) asked and refused, did not go to disfranchise the real bonâ fide holder of a freehold in fee, but only to suppress this manufacture of fraudulent votes; and it had received the approbation of Dr. Doyle's political friends and associates; one cause probably of his reluctance to avow before the Committee his own recorded opinion against it.

But that opinion itself was given after a statement of the most extraordinary kind; I will present it to my readers in Dr. Doyle's own words.

“ Many of our laws are, in the abstract, perfectly wise and equitable, but amongst us even the good laws in their operation work injustice.” “ The law of election, what does it

“ bring to the Catholic? If he perchance be opulent, it brings
 “ to him a deeper sense of his fallen honour, of his degradation,
 “ of his shame; if he be very poor, it brings him to the hus-
 “ tings to proclaim to the world a public lie, to wit, that he is
 “ a freeholder; having first *steeped his soul in perjury*, lest he,
 “ and his wife, and his child, and his father, should be driven
 “ from their hut, without food, shelter, or hope. To him the
 “ *election law, in its operation, is like the wind from the desert,*
 “ *bringing with it a sort of moral pestilence, against which no*
 “ *human remedy can avail.*”—p. 87.*

Dr. Doyle is a Christian, a minister of the Gospel, a bishop in the Church of Christ. What, then, must the man, who bears so high and sacred a function, say and feel of a proposed law, whose object is, without entrenching on the rights of the real freeholder, to put an end at once to a system so pregnant with sin and crime? Must he not hail it with delight and transport? Not so Dr. Doyle:—in the very same volume, we read, with astonishment, which all that we have before seen and heard of this prelate can hardly diminish, the following portentous sentence; “ *If there be one measure more than another calculated to seal the doom of Ireland, to eradicate from her soil the very seeds of freedom, and to ensure*

* He elsewhere speaks of the same law as “ sometimes exposing the people to the moral necessity of committing perjury in order to retain possession of what they call their freehold.”—p. 359.

“ for ever her degradation, that measure is, in my opinion, the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders.”—(p. 205.) Well might Dr. Doyle deprecate the necessity of repeating or avowing before an assembly of English Christians such an opinion on such a case!

But I am tired of Dr. Doyle—I will refer to only one particular more of him, and will then have done.*

5. He is asked by the Committees both of Commons and of Lords, “ whether he holds the

* Yet the following is too curious to be omitted: in answer to a question from the Committee of Commons, p. 216, Dr. Doyle says, “ *I have never discerned in any class; or in any individual, of the Catholic religion, either clergy or laity, I might say, any disposition hostile to the Protestant established religion.*” For an illustration of the truth of this assertion, I refer to the Letters of I. K. L. *passim*, and to the following extract from Dr. Doyle’s Letter to Mr. Robertson, p. 3: “ *The Ministers of the Establishment, as it exists at present, are, and will be, detested by those who differ from them; and the more their residence is enforced, and their number multiplied, the more odious they will become.*”

Dr. Doyle is not the only person who makes a favourable report to the House of Commons of the disposition of the people of his communion towards the Established Church. In the year 1821 Mr. Plunket (a name to which I certainly would not do the injustice of coupling it with Dr. Doyle’s generally) said, and said, I doubt not, as he believed: “ *On the part of the Roman Catholics I will be bold to say, that they harbour no principle of hostility to our Establishment.*”

“ opinions with respect to the Established Church, which are maintained in the letters of “ I. K. L.” his own notorious work ? His answer I will take, as it is given before the Lords, because he there spoke under the solemn sanction of an oath.

“ The opinions which I entertain with regard to the Establishment are these ; and as the letters alluded to are many, and they may contain opinions which might be misunderstood, I think it better to make myself responsible for the answer I here give, than for what is found written in those letters. The Established Church in Ireland I look at in two lights : as a Christian community, and as a corporation enjoying vast temporal possessions. *As a Christian Church, consisting of a hierarchy, and professing the doctrine of the Gospel, I respect and esteem it more than any other church in the universe separated from the See of Rome : but I do unquestionably think, that the amount of property enjoyed by the ministers of that Church is prejudicial to the interests of the established religion in Ireland, as well as to the interests of the country. I have, therefore, given to your Lordships my feelings and opinions in those words most explicitly ; and I believe that they are the same in substance as those expressed in the letters alluded to, if those letters be understood in the sense, in which I understand them myself.*”—Lords, p. 234.

Here, then, he declares upon his oath, that, although he thinks the Church of Ireland too richly endowed for its own interests, and for the interests of the country, yet he has a higher respect, and esteem, for it, as a Chris-

tian Church, than for any other church in the universe separated from the See of Rome.

This he gives, I say, *upon his oath*, as a summary of his own feelings and opinions *most explicitly* stated, and of those which are *expressed in the letters of I. K. L.*

I shall now beg leave to make some extracts from these letters, to illustrate the accuracy of this sworn testimony.

Once, and I believe, only once, he is pleased to admit that the Church is better than the Conventicle, and he does so in the following flattering expression of his "respect and esteem for it :"—

"The Establishment has brought back from the Conventicle many a strayed sheep. This should be, to every person who wishes well to society, a subject of congratulation, as it is painful and humiliating to see our fellow-creatures so bewildered, as to exchange any *regular form of worship, however imperfect*, for the ravings of their own fancy, or the wild and fantastical canting of some self-sanctioned enthusiast."—p. 67.

While, however, he thus expresses his sense of the superiority of the Church over wild enthusiasts, he takes care not to give it any preference over Presbyterians. So far from it, indeed, that he *no where* speaks so respectfully of the former, as he does, in the following sentence, of the latter :—

“ Of the state of religion amongst the Presbyterians I know but little, and I regret that I have not had more opportunities of making myself acquainted with the principles and practice of that respectable people, as well as with the character of their clergy.” (p. 66.)

We have seen I. K. L.'s strongest expressions of respect for the Established Church; let us now look to the other side. At page 61 he expressly says, that “the Catholics deem the altar of that Church profane.” At page 329, its clergy are spoken of, as not being really clergy—they are “Clergymen (*so called.*)” At page 69 we read what follows:—

“ The Church in Ireland was always looked on, not as the Spouse of the Redeemer, but as the handmaid of the ascendency.” “ Whenever she became insolent, or forgot her rank, (if rank it could be called) she was rebuked into a deportment becoming her situation.” “ When indulged, she is insolent; when rebuked, she becomes attentive; she draws tight, or relaxes her discipline, as it may please, or be permitted by her masters; her eye is ever fixed upon her own interests, and *she deems nothing forbidden or unhallowed, which can serve to promote them.* As those who do an injury never can forgive, she is implacable in her hostility to the Church which she supplanted; and at this day she appears *indifferent to all things else, but to the concealment of her riches, and the persecution of Popery.*” (He has elsewhere said, “the Established Church would ally itself with the priests of Baal,”

* This is comparatively a more respectable alliance, than may at first appear. I. K. L. says of the Irish Roman-Catholics (as we have already seen) that if the Legislature continues to insult them, they will *league with Beelzebub* against us. (p. 285.)

"against those whom it has supplanted."—p. 153.) "She occasionally revolts against her fellow-servants," (who are they?) "who lay bare her spoils, who tell of her frauds and oppressions, who remind her of her origin, and upbraid her with the profligacy of her misspent life." "*Her Creed is no longer the creed of a great proportion of those who fill her pulpits, or who bend before her altars.*" (p. 68.) "On the whole it appears to me, that religion at present in the Established Church is rather excited by the spirit of party, than the Spirit of the Gospel; that she has been awakened rather by the sounds of discord, than by the voice of peace." (p. 79.)

It is thus, that the Letters of I. K. L. make good the sworn attestation of our Right Reverend witness. Yet this is Dr. Doyle! this is, or lately was, (for these glories are not often very long-lived,) the idol of the liberal party in our English House of Commons! one, whom statesmen have not scrupled to laud in good set sentences, as a paragon of talent, and the very mirror of honesty!

In exhibiting him in his real colours, in holding him forth in his own recorded words and sentiments, to the indignation of every man to whom truth and plain dealing are not empty names, I have performed a duty painful and disgusting to my own feelings; a duty, by the discharge of which I may perhaps draw down upon myself the ribaldry of Scotch critics, the revilings of Irish orators, the sneers of English

liberals, and the half-vented rebukes of the friends of conciliation. Be it so! from all these censors I appeal to the unbiassed judgment and honest sympathy of the British people: and if my cause be as good, as my own conscience tells me that it is, to that tribunal I shall not appeal in vain.

HENRY PHILLPOTTS.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.







